DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 663 JC 710 051

AUTHOR	Schafer, Michael I., Comp.
TITLE	Faculty Evaluation Working Papers: 1970-71 Revision.
INSTITUTION	Florida Community Junior Coll. Inter-institutional Research Council.
PUB DATE	Jan 71
NOTE	130p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Needs, *Evaluation Techniques, *Faculty Evaluation, *Junior Colleges, Relevance (Education), Student Evaluation, *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Florida

ABSTRACT

This document attempts to provide information on what has been done on evaluation of faculty in Florida's community junicr colleges. There is a need for a clear definition of excellent teaching and a need for a means of measuring or evaluating such teaching. The five discussions comprising this document are: (1) evaluation of faculty by students, (2) problems of evaluating teaching, (3) faculty evaluation--some poorly considered musings, (4) an abstract of Measuring Faculty Performance, and (5) evaluation of faculty and educational objectives. Also included are faculty evaluation forms. (CA)

ED 047663

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY EVALUATION WORKING PAPERS

1970-71 Revision

Compiled by:

Michael I. Schafer
Associate Director

Florida Community Junior College
Inter-institutional Research Council

January, 1971

JC 710 051

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 0 8 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

In response to a need expressed by member institutions, the IRC prepared a set of Faculty Evaluation Working Papers in August, 1969. In attempting to develop meaningful faculty evaluation instruments, colleges were faced with a complete lack of base-line data upon which to build.

The following materials have been chosen on the basis of their potential value to groups working on designing or revising evaluation forms. Each of the materials included may have weaknesses which make them inappropriate for use by all community colleges. Faculty groups using these papers should attempt to benefit by the mistakes of others in developing materials appropriate for their institution and their faculty.

This 1970-71 revision follows the form of the first edition. Many faculty groups have revised their forms since August, 1969. These revisions are included in this edition. The staff of the Research Council is available to give assistance to member colleges developing faculty evaluation materials.

Michael I. Schafer
Associate Director
Florida Community Junior College
Inter-institutional Research Council

January, 1971

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EDITION

Community junior colleges in Florida have established, through their philosophies and stated objective, the goal of high quality instruction as a primary rationale for their existence. The place of quality teaching at the central core of purposes for these colleges was pointed out as early as 1925 by Koos. Examining the statements of those writing on the junior college since that time, it may be seen that high quality instruction has continued to be a primary aim of these colleges. Thornton has said of the junior college: "Either it teaches excellently or it fails completely."

In trying to provide the high quality of instruction that the community junior college concept demands, the college is faced with a number of obstacles. Foremost among these is the need for a clear definition of excellent teaching. A corollary need is for a means of measuring or evaluating such teaching.

If community junior colleges are to improve the quality of their teaching they must be able to measure the state of their teaching at a given time.

The question arises, what are we measuring when we measure teaching? A variety of measures have been used, ranging from measures of the morals of the teacher to multidimensional approaches including student growth, teacher-student interaction, rating scal es, etc. A sincere effort has been made by most colleges to develop some instrument to measure teaching.

This set of working papers is not an attempt to answer the problems of faculty evaluation. Rather, it is an attempt to provide information on what has been done in the area of Evaluation of Faculty in Florida's community junior colleges to this time. The papers also include statements by several educators that may offer possible sources of improvement in faculty evaluation.

This set of papers is an initial step toward the planning of a meaningful model for the evaluation of instruction. As with other efforts these plans must be aimed toward implementation. For, "planning without implementation is futile, but implementation without planning is fatal."

Michael I. Schafer
Associate Director
Florida Community Junior College
Inter-institutional Research Council

August, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	i
Introduction to the First Edition	ii
Evaluation of Faculty by Students ..... Wattenbarger, James L. Gager, Jr., William A. Stuckman, Jeffrey A.	1-8
Problems of Evaluating Teaching ..... Centra, John A.	9-12
Faculty Evaluation--Some Poorly Considered Musings ... Nunnery, Michael Y.	13-25
Abstract--Measuring Faculty Performance ..... Cohen, Arthur M. Brawer, Florence B. --Abstracted by Michael I. Schafer	26-27
Evaluation of Faculty and Educational Objectives ..... Roberts, Dayton Y.	28
Faculty Evaluation Forms	29-

EVALUATION OF FACULTY BY STUDENTS

By

James L. Wattenbarger
Director, Institute of Higher Education

with the assistance of

William A. Gager, Jr.
Jeffrey A. Stuckman

The attached annotated bibliography summarizes major examples of current thinking in this regard as may be found in the literature.

Characteristics of a Good Evaluation Program

1. Student rating is only one part of a total program of faculty evaluation and must be consonant with the other elements used.

2. Effective evaluation (as differentiated from observation) requires training and orientation of the evaluators.

3. In the rating process, a student has two roles to play: observer and evaluator. As an observer he provides raw and unweighted information not available to anyone else. As an evaluator his major competence is in areas related to the personal effectiveness of the instructor and the establishment of student-instructor rapport.

4. Appropriate indicators of good teaching vary with the course, the subject, and the objectives of the course.

5. The criteria for good teaching should be developed by the teaching faculty and the administrators as well as by students.

6. An institution should develop its own rating instruments.

7. For an evaluation program to be effective, the results must have significance in the incentives for the faculty and in the institution's personnel practices. Similarly, the students must perceive that the ratings have significance.

8. A "volunteer program" will not achieve the objectives of a sound faculty evaluation procedure.

I

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evaluation of Faculty by Students in Higher Education

1. Blackman, A. F., et al. "Students Rate Their Profs and Courses," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48: 266-9, F '67.

A review of the experience of the first year of a student-prepared booklet describing courses and professors in the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The article describes problems encountered, and includes samples of the student evaluations and the responses by the faculty.

The method seems highly subjective, and the problems mentioned would appear to be major fallacies in the method used, especially the problems of unsystematic samples and summation of evaluation by biased parties.

2. deBruin, H. C. "Quality Instruction," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 15: 214-15, Autumn, 1967.

This article reports on characteristics of good instruction, such as knowledge of subject matter, sensitivity to needs of individual students, trust and respect for students, and self-confidence. The author holds that effectiveness in teaching is a highly individual matter for which there is no common mold. (The implication is that it would be very difficult to prepare a description of effective teaching to use as a basis of evaluation.)

3. Bryan, Roy C. "Student Rating of Teachers," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 16 (Summer, 1968), pp. 200-202.

Results of a study of 307 institutions which offer a bachelor's degree and have an enrollment of 1,500 or more students pursuant to the use of student ratings. The mechanics of a student rating process are stressed.

4. Bryant, P. T. "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them," *Journal of Higher Education*, 38: 326-30, Je '67.

The author distrusts the ability of students to rate instructors. He feels students are subjective, inexperienced, and unqualified. He holds that the criterion should be what is learned. Judgment should be by the teacher's peers, and should be an evaluation of what is learned based on review of examinations and required papers.

5. Carpenter, Finley, et al. "Student Preference of Instructor Types as a Function of Subject Matter," *Science Education*, 49 (April, 1965), pp. 235-238.

Having presented verbal vignettes of three types of instructors (examples presented in article) to 125 students (mostly juniors) at the University of Michigan, the authors conclude that establishing rank order lists of important teacher traits cannot be expected to have practical value because student preferences vary considerably according to the situation or course of study.

6. Collisan, Peter. "Piercing the Barrier," *The Times Educational Supplement*, 2770 (June 21, 1968), p. 2071.

The communication aspect of instructor rating by students is pointed out by the author's own personal experience with a 13-item questionnaire. The author found students' written comments, which they would not offer verbally, helpful in correcting behaviorisms which were decreasing his effectiveness.

7. Hoffman, Randall W. "Students Portray the Excellent Teacher," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 11 (Winter, 1963), pp. 21-24.

Results of an instructor evaluation form distributed to seniors of Hofstra College are reported. The attributes most appreciated by these students are the instructor's attitude toward students, presentation in class, personal characteristics and general worthiness, and stimulation of thought and interest. The article is replete with sample responses, but is void of any quantitative data.

8. Isaacson, Robert L., et al. "Dimensions of Student Evaluation of Teaching," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55 (December, 1964), pp. 344-351.

Approximately 300 students at the University of Michigan rated their instructors via a 46-item questionnaire (a sample of which is presented in the report) derived from 145 items that had been used elsewhere. This study confirms the factors that other studies have found important to be measured by a questionnaire, e.g., teaching skills, interaction with students, rapport.

9. Kent, L. "Student Evaluation of Teaching," *Educational Record*, 47: 376-406, Summer '66.

The author believes that evaluations are of value, and should be published for best results; that evaluations are effective only if the faculty is concerned about improving quality of instruction (and in many cases they are not); that if evaluation affects promotion and tenure that only evaluations of adequate or superior students should be used; that each institution should develop its own rating forms; and that much more research is needed on rating devices themselves.

10. Langen, Thomas D. F., "Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 14 (Winter, 1966), pp. 22-25.

Report of the method used by the University of Washington to garner student opinion of teaching competency. Two sample questionnaires are presented as well as samples of students' comments.

11. Mayhew, L. B., "Tissue Committee for Teachers," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 15: 5-10, Winter '67.

Mayhew sees teacher evaluation as action research in which modification of the subjects is the product of the research. It involves use of diaries, tape recordings, video tapes, check sheets, student questionnaires, outside interviews, visits by other teachers, and administrative evalutaion. A record should be kept on each faculty member of professional activities, student test performances, student comments, results of administrative visits, offers from other institutions, professional consultation, and results of student evaluation surveys.

12. Musella, Donald and Reuben Rusch. "Student Opinion on College Teaching," *Improving College and University Teaching*, 16 (Spring, 1958), pp. 137-140.

Results of a study of the characteristics and behaviors of university professors which promote thinking and which are associated with effective teaching in general, as perceived by 394 seniors at the State University of New York. "Expert Knowledge of Subject" was chosen frequently by students as an important characteristic associated with effective teaching in general while "sympathetic attitude toward students" and "pleasing personality" were characteristics considered of lesser importance.

13. Phillips, Beeman N. "The 'Individual' and the 'Classroom Group' as Frames of Reference in Determining Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Educational Research*, 58 (November, 1964), pp. 128-131.

A questionnaire of 12 items (an example of which is presented) measuring four factors, viz., amount of structure provided, amount of information given about tests, amount of achievement motivation aroused, and amount of personal warmth in class, was administered to 165 sophomores at the University of Texas. The authors conclude that a highly structured class with highly "visible" tests is preferred by students over a highly motivating class with a strong emphasis on personal warmth.

14. Renner, R. R. "A Successful Rating Scale," *Improving College and University Teaching*, XV: 12-14, Winter, 1967.

In the author's view, students are the best judges of whether a professor's course was valuable in spite of their shortcomings as evaluators.

It is suggested that it is best to get the rating while the course is fresh in the student's mind. A full page sample of the rating scale favored by the author is included.

15. Samalonis, B., "Ratings by Students, " *Improving College and University Teaching*, XV: 11 Winter, 1967.

The author thinks that students are capable of rating faculty; that such ratings should be One basis for faculty advancement; that evaluating criteria should be worked out by students and faculty combined; that rating should be made ideally after graduation, and that faculty members should be given time to improve. Such ratings provide an alternative to publish or perish system.

16. Stewart, Cliffort T. and Leslie F. Malpass, "Estimates of Achievement and Ratings of Instructors," *Journal of Educational Research*, 59 (April, 1966), pp. 347-350.

Report of a study conducted at the University of South Florida of the relationship between college students' grade-estimates and their ratings of selected instructor characteristics. The conclusions, which were based on the findings of 11 selected items of a 37-item form returned by 1,975 students, were that students expecting high grades rated the instructor higher and agree with the grading policy more than do students expecting lower grades. The 11 selected items are presented.

17. Strand, D.A. "Rationale and Instrument for Student Evaluation of Classroom Teaching," *National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal*, 30: 36-9, Fall '66.

No one individual or group, to be dean, department head, colleague, or student, can make a total evaluation of a faculty member. "Good teaching is relative to a given course in a particular field in a specific institution." Thus there must be categorical differences in construction of rating scales.

Student evaluations are helpful in evaluating personal effectiveness in teaching, rapport between students and their teacher, and organization of a course.

An evaluation form is appended.

18. Weaver, Carl H. "Instructor Rating by College Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51 (February, 1960), pp. 21-25.

Reports of findings of a study done at Central Michigan University concerning the interaction of the expectation on the part of the student of receiving a given grade and the rating given the instructor by that student. The conclusions derived from the results of the ratings of 699 students

grouped according to grade expectations were that student ratings are biased in the direction of expected grades, and this bias is directed toward teaching skills and abilities--not toward personality variables.

19. Wedeen, Shirley U. "Comparison of Student Reaction to Similar, Concurrent Teacher-Content Instruction," *Journal of Educational Research*, 56 (July, 1963), pp. 540-543.

Two classes of sophomore students taught by the author at Brooklyn College completed Brooklyn College's "Student Reaction to Teaching" questionnaire. The author found that the class composed of eight-month-older and one-semester-in-advance students were less favorable of the class and instructor than was the other class. Thus two sections of the same course taught by the same instructor at the same time with identical assignments and examinations can be perceived differently by different groups of students.

II

The University of Florida Student Government Association has collected sample forms and procedures used by other universities in the country. These are available for examination in their office.

Examples of Instructor Evaluation Instruments on file at the University of Florida Student Government offices:

The City College of the City University of New York: *Student Course and Teacher Evaluation*

Florida State University: *Student Evaluation of Faculty: Survey of Student Reactions to Courses and Teaching.*

Marquette University: *Student Evaluation of Classroom Teaching.*

Morningside College (Sioux City, Iowa): *A Student's Rating Scale of an Instructor.*

Purdue Research Foundation (West Lafayette, Indiana): *Student Government Course and Teacher Evaluation* (1950).

Purdue University: *The Purdue Instructor Performance Indicator: The Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction.*

San Francisco State College: *Course Evaluation Questionnaire.*

San Jose State College: *Instructor Rating Scale*

University of Colorado (Boulder): *Course Analysis Questionnaire.*

University of Florida: College of Business Administration-- *Student Questionnaire as to Instruction in Accounting.*

University of Florida: College of Education--*A Study of the Teacher Education Program at the University of Florida.*

University of Indiana (Bloomington): *Experimental Class and Faculty Evaluation Sheet 1965-66.*

University of Minnesota: Minnesota Student Association Course Evaluation Project -- *Student Questionnaire.*

University of North Carolina: Student Government Academic Affairs Committee--*Course and Instructor Information Form.*

Washington State University (Pullman): *Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness.*

Published Student Guides on Courses and Instructors:

University of Alabama: *Faculty-Course Evaluation Report,* Volume 1, Fall Semester, 1968.

University of Southern California: *USC Student Guide* - 1967.

III

A number of faculty members at the University of Florida has conducted research into this area of faculty evaluation. Two examples of this thinking are Dr. C. M. Bridges and Dr. Bob Burton Brown in the College of Education. Following herewith are brief reports of their current thinking as reported by the interview.

(Interview with Dr. C. M. Bridges, November 7, 1968)

Dr. C. M. Bridges is designing an instrument for evaluation of faculty by students. Essentially, the instrument is devised by asking groups of students, faculty, and administrators to list their views of the seven characteristics of best teaching performance and the seven characteristics of worst teaching performance. These descriptions are then converted into behavioral statements, and grouped into six categories. Within each of the six categories, the "best" statements are ranked 1 to 5 by a group of students and a group of faculty. The "worst" are similarly ranked. The six categories are then ranked from one to six in importance to good instruction by a panel of students and a panel of faculty. The weighted importance of any behavioral statement is the product of its "within category rank" and its "category rank."

In use, any behavioral statement may be lined out as inappropriate by the student filling out the sheet or by the department in which the instruction was given. A ratio score will then be computed which shows ranking by specific item, by category, and on the whole.

Dr. Bridges expects to have an instrument ready shortly. He feels that adequate validation is built into the instrument he is designing, and no follow-up is planned. Differences in conceptions of what good teaching is as viewed by students on the one hand and faculty on the other can be accounted for by what is ruled out as inappropriate at the time of use. Dr. Bridges sees no need for preliminary studies or orientations at this university before use of the instrument. He does not think an instructor should have a right of rebuttal of findings. No safeguards are considered necessary.

The use of a rating instrument provides an opportunity to rate faculty by a criterion other than publications, but obviously the utility of evaluation depends upon good teaching becoming a rewarded characteristic of a faculty member.

(Interview with Dr. Bob Burton Brown, November 8, 1968)

Dr. Brown has been using a faculty rating instrument which takes as its basic approach the position that students should give descriptive data which is then evaluated by the faculty member's peers. An attempt is made to adjust for the personality idiosyncracies of the student observer, the peer evaluator, and the administrator using the evaluation. This is done by giving a personality and attitude inventory test to each person involved, and adjusting his part in the evaluation in terms of his attitude profile.

Dr. Brown has used this instrument in the public schools, and reports that it is not at present adapted for higher education. Some of the principles should be important considerations, however, in developing an instrument for the University of Florida.

PROBLEMS OF EVALUATING TEACHING

John A. Centra
Instructor, Office of Institutional Research
Michigan State University

(As published in "Current Issues in Higher Education," The Association of Higher Education, 1966. pp. 261-264).

In our complex and less than perfect scholastic society, there are some good teachers, many adequate teachers, and some bad teachers; and administrators must attempt to evaluate faculty members in order to have some basis for retention and promotion. In making these judgments, administrators may say that teaching is a heavily weighted factor; yet it doesn't take the young faculty member long to find out that in most cases, other factors, particularly the number of publications, really pay off in promotion. The question is then: Why don't administrators, in reality, put more emphasis on teaching performance in faculty appraisals? And the answer, in brief, lies in the problems of evaluating teaching.

First, there is the difficulty of defining good teaching, which is the initial step of evaluation. Good teaching, like beautiful women, is a subject on which everyone has his own idea, and everyone thinks he can recognize on sight. In short, like beautiful women, good teaching is too often thought of in the abstract. Specifically, discussions of good teaching usually center on knowledge of subject matter, an understanding of students, and the like. But this is not precise enough. What is needed in addition, it would seem, is first a clear statement of the objectives of a course and what is meant by good teaching in that subject; and second, a clear statement of the purposes of a particular institution, and what is meant by good teaching at that institution. Inherent in both of these specifics is the fact that dispensing fragmented subject matter, no matter how well done, does not constitute good teaching. Instead, good teaching implies that each course has some relevance to its own field and to other fields of knowledge. Thus, in the final analysis, the question is not "What is good teaching?" but "What is good teaching in 'X' course within 'Y' field at 'Z' institution?"

The second general problem in evaluating teaching can be stated quite simply: How? One of the most logical methods of evaluating teaching is by testing student achievement. Although this can be done by merely assessing what students have learned at the end of a course, pre-testing as well as post-testing students is necessary for more valid conclusions. Desirable changes in students are, certainly, the ultimate criteria of effective college teaching; but these changes involve the affective as well as the cognitive domain and are difficult to measure. The lack of adequate instruments and a lack of norms to test outcomes are just two of the limitations. More important, changes in student attitudes, values, and even knowledge are likely influenced by many factors such as student motivation, maturation, personal traits, campus climate, and peer group contacts. Hence, how does one measure the

changes due solely to the quality of teaching? And finally, the most significant outcomes of effective teaching may not be truly reflected in a test score or interview following completion of the course, but rather in the continued learning and value patterns of the student many years later.

Several other methods are used to evaluate teaching, and all are less objective than the pre- and post-testing method. The most commonly used methods are student ratings, informal student opinion, classroom visitations, colleagues' opinions, and the opinions of a chairman or dean. Although there are varying degrees of objectivity in these methods, they all seem to represent examples of a once-uttered definition of objectivity: objectivity is putting your biases on the table.

The opinions of chairmen and deans in evaluating a faculty member's teaching ability are probably the least objective method used. Most often, these opinions are based on hearsay alone. Colleagues' opinions may be based on a greater number of contacts than opinions by chairmen or deans, but their subjectivity is no less a problem. Somewhat more objective, however, are evaluations based on classroom observations. But becuase most faculty regard classroom observations and ratings by supervisors or peers as both a threat to their security and an invasion of privacy, they often strongly resent this method. These evaluations are usually further discredited by the infrequency of observations, the lack of definable criteria, and the tendency for some teachers to react unnaturally while being observed.

This leads us to that group increasingly heard from on American campuses: students. Their comments and opinions on instructors and courses are currently expressed in three ways: (1) informal student opinion, (2) publications put out by students, and (3) formal student ratings. Within the past year, all three of these methods have become more common. Informal student opinions are unstructured verbal reports, either solicited by administrators or offered freely by students, that often become part of the hearsay some administrators use to evaluate a teacher. The shortcomings of this approach are obvious: it is neither systematic nor objective, and thus can be quite inaccurate as well as unfair for an instructor.

Usually more objective than informal student opinions are the guides to courses and teachers published annually by students at some institutions. At their best, these publications are based on ample evidence and try to be fair; at their worst, which might well be most of the time, they are based on replies from only a few students in a course and can be brutally unfair. In either case, these publications reflect student concern for the quality of instruction they are receiving; and in the activist spirit of the times, students are seeking to do something about it.

The third way in which students evaluate teaching is through formal ratings distributed by each instructor, a method currently being revived on many campuses. In fact, the editor of *Harper's* magazine, John Fischer, recently proposed that this method might be a solution to the problem of establishing an objective base for rewarding good teaching. Specifically, he suggested that "a tripartite group, including representatives of the faculty, the administration, and graduate students in each

department" evaluate anonymous student ratings of each course. "The ratings need not be published; they could merely be used as one indicator (along with others, including scholarly accomplishment) to guide department heads in deciding on awards of permanent tenure, salary increases, and promotions."

The advocates of formal student ratings of instruction argue that we get a better idea of the merits of the dinner from the dinner guests than from the cook. There is every indication that in certain areas, student ratings of instruction can be valid and useful. Past studies, on the whole, indicate that student judgments of classroom procedures and student-teacher interaction are more reliable than overall student judgments of the instructor himself. Students can accurately report, for example, whether the material was clearly presented, whether they were stimulated to work in a course, whether objectives were made clear, and whether the course seemed worthwhile to them. But, just as many a dinner guest is not able to judge the finer points of a meal, students also are not necessarily classroom connoisseurs. Students, for instance, cannot report as accurately other aspects of effective teaching, such as the instructor's qualifications in the subject, the soundness of objectives, the validity of reference material, and the intrinsic merit of the course. Hence, in devising a rating form, it is important that the sphere of inquiry center around organization of course activities, and instructional techniques and procedures. If it does, research indicates that student ratings of instruction will likely be consistent with those made by trained observers. Student ratings, however, will tend to be less valid when limited to the qualifications and characteristics of the instructor, for too often students equate good teaching with an exuberant personality and an entertaining manner of lecturing.

Too often, also, students fail to realize that they too have a responsibility for learning. And when a student instructional rating scale does not include items measuring student participation and commitment in a course, the scale is contributing to this fallacy. Thus, scales should include, for example, items in which students evaluate the amount of time and effort they have put into a course. In this way, students, hopefully, will not underestimate their part in the learning process.

Some institutions have attempted to reward excellence in teaching by means of a few annual monetary awards. The assumption in this approach is that the prospect of honor and money (not necessarily in that order) provides incentive to all teachers to improve their teaching. But it is possible that the awards have no such effect; for example, when made as a pre-retirement gesture of appreciation for long and devoted service to the institution; or when selections reward good research or good public relations instead of good teaching. (There is nothing wrong with such awards, but they should be identified for what they are.) Certainly there is no evidence that special awards or bonuses have a significant effect on the improvement of teaching; and they may even damage faculty morale if the recipients do not, in the eyes of many faculty members, really deserve the award.

Another example is provided in Oregon, where last spring the legislature appropriated a half million dollars for the state's public colleges and universities

to reward undergraduate-level teaching. The plan called for students to be involved in either the nomination or selection of award winners, and specified that to be qualified, each professor had to teach an average of two three-credit undergraduate courses during at least two quarters of the academic year. Although some of the institutions accepted the plan immediately, the faculties at other units were sharply divided. It soon become apparent to both laymen and the legislature that evaluating and rewarding good teaching were intricate and delicate matters, to which the academic community reacted quite strongly. As one professor said, "Even if you wanted to 'try out' for an award you wouldn't know how to change your teaching. This whole reward setup is too much like a beauty contest."

In other parts of the country, other methods are being considered to evaluate and reward teaching. At least two institutions are discussing programs in which a select group of superior students would judge faculty, the results being used for promotion and tenure. The effects of such a plan, if adopted, will indeed be interesting to watch; but offhand, one wonders about the instructor who is more effective with the less able student.

Faculties have resisted, and probably always will resist, external evaluations. But perhaps college faculties are concerned enough about teaching to cooperate in programs for improvement, particularly if evidence of participation in improvement programs is submissible by each instructor in support of his tenure and promotion recommendation. Furthermore, each faculty member might also be invited to submit evidence of his effectiveness in teaching. Such evidence could be provided by a combination of methods discussed in this paper: for example, anonymous student ratings, and judgments by colleagues who have visited their classes. Although I have noted that these methods are not perfect, the history of science is laden with instances of theories and methodology having served useful purposes, even though these same theories and methods were later replaced by more effective ones.

FACULTY EVALUATION--SOME POORLY CONSIDERED MUSINGS*

Michael Y. Nunnery

We cannot and we should not avoid faculty evaluation. However, we must be more systematic in our efforts. I would argue that a faculty evaluation plan, well planned and appropriately executed, can provide a basis for reward--promotion, salary increase, tenure and this sort of thing. It can be the basis for sanction--failure to promote, failure to give increases, etc. It can motivate for a higher level performance. (If I know that I am to be evaluated, I will make an effort to perform a little bit better.) If appropriately done, it can be the basis for a faculty development and in-service program.

Since I am concerned with faculty evaluation, I have given some thought to the matter. However, I do not feel well equipped to make a great deal of application to the junior college. So I am leaving myself wide open when I talk with people who have long years of experience in the community colleges. However, I have some ideas and I believe one way to test ideas is to try them out on an intelligent, critical group. Thus I am grateful for the opportunity to be here. I would like to do four things in the next thirty minutes or so.

First, I would like to make a few comments on evaluation <u>per se</u>, so as to place the concept of faculty evaluation in some kind of perspective. Second, I would like to identify what seems to be the crucial steps in any evaluation scheme involving faculty. Third,I would like to review some generalizations relative to the present state of the art (science) of faculty evaluation. Fourth, I would like to advance a proposal for faculty evaluation. Really, the first three parts provide a kind of rationale for the proposal I am going to advance for your critical consideration.

---

*A transcript of a presentation made at the Florida Community Junior College Inter-institutional Seminar on Institutional Research, Tuesday, May 20, 1969.

Evaluation per se. Vincent and others have identified two major approaches to evaluation. I am sure you all have been down this road--I just want to review with you briefly. Vincent talks in terms of output evaluation and process evaluation. By output evaluation we are talking about measuring output. What this demands is agreement on what is the expected product (output) and what is the acceptable measure of the product. In education, if we say educated students constitute the product of the institution and we use the output scheme to measure the effectiveness of the institution, then we will be measuring student success in terms of some acceptable "yardstick". This is our output.

There are three obvious problems when you start looking at the output evaluation in relation to an educational institution. First, you've got to design the long-term test. In other words, if you are going to measure student success you've got to do a longitudinal study of it. You've got to look at them from the time they go out, finish their work career, die, etc. So, you have the problem of a long-term test. The second problem you have with output is controlling the variables. Any good researcher will talk about the need to control variables. You must either neutralize or ferret out the confounding variables so that you can deal with just the variable(s) under consideration. When you start controlling the variables, you must recognize that schooling is but one factor that affects the success of the individual's life. In other words, socio-economic status, place and time of birth, marriage, etc., have an influence on "success." The third problem is the lack of agreement of what is success. I could define it in dollars and cents. Some people would define it as the number of children successfully raised. Another person might define it in still another way.

Output evaluation has been tried many times in education but with only very limited success. For example, you can use output evaluation in your institution in terms of the number of students that go on to four-year colleges. But that would be looking at only one of what I perceive to be the functions of community colleges.

The process approach to evaluation is much more complex and far less visible. Here, we identify and assess the critical elements in the educational process. There is a great deal of argument about what constitutes the critical elements. However, if you will look at the process evaluation schemes, they seem to be assuming that these critical elements include such things as curriculum; the supporting services, such as library, etc.; the facilities that are available; the organization within which the education takes place; and teaching. There may be other critical elements.

If teaching is a critical element of the process of education then it seems to me that faculty evaluation is a part of the process approach. I think it is important that we recognize this. We are looking at process evaluation when we are evaluating faculty if teaching constitutes one of the critical elements in the educational process. Therefore, it seems that it also follows that the "name of the game" in faculty evaluation is to identify and measure those elements in faculty performance that are critical to the process of educating students. If you desire to put it more broadly, it seems to me "the name of the game" is to identify and measure those elements of faculty performance that are critical to the achievement of the objectives or goals of the institution.

The key point thus far is that there are two approaches to evaluation--output and process. I submit that faculty evaluation is a process approach. If it is a process approach then what we are trying to do is identify the critical elements in the performance of the faculty that relate to the achievement of the organizational goals.

Critical steps in a Faculty Evaluation Scheme. If my logic is anywhere near sound, there are about four basic steps in any evaluation scheme. The first step should be to determine the objectives of the institution--what is to be accomplished? I would assume that we would justify the "what in terms of some why." For example, we say we want to turn out "x" number of millwrights.

That is a "what." Why do we want to do this? The society demands the skill or something of this order. The systems people talk about are objectives justified in terms of needs. I am talking about the same thing. You are dealing with what-why questions. What is to be accomplished? Why do we want to accomplish this?

To me it would logically follow that in terms of the objectives of the institution the next step in a faculty evaluation scheme is the determination of the role of the faculty. If you go back to Parsons and Shils and some of the people in this area, they talk about role being defined in terms of the expectancies associated with the role. So, when we talk about the determination of the role what we are really talking about is the determination of the expectancies. Expectancy is the analytical unit of role. The way we describe this most often is in the job description that grows out of job analysis. I am arguing that the second basic step in any faculty evaluation scheme is the determination of role that will eventually be translated to the job description. This is an abstract of one's role.

The third step is the determination of standards of performance in relation to the role or those expectancies associated with the role. What constitutes acceptable standards of performance? I would submit that these can be both quantitative and qualitative. More about that point later.

Once one has determined what is to be accomplished, what the role of the individual faculty member is in regard to the accomplishment of the objective, what standards are to be applied by which we will judge the extent to which one performs his role, then it seems to me the fourth major step is gathering and interpreting evidence in regard to the standard. This involves the development of an instrument(s), deciding who is to apply the instrument(s) and in what context, providing relative weights to the evidence you gather, and interpretation. Let us leave critical steps for a moment and turn to a third topic.

Generalizations About the Present State of Faculty Evaluation. The first point I would make is in regard to the determination of the objectives of an institution and relating these to the roles of different people. We haven't done a very good job of it. We've managed to lay out institutional objectives quite broadly such as "for motherhood and against sin." This is about the level of many of our objectives. We have done very little in trying to relate the roles to institutional objectives. This to me is a great weakness in all evaluation schemes and the proposal I have to offer simply ignores this in large part. I will explain it a little bit later. If you can believe what you read and what you hear, there is going to be a big push on this in the immediate future. I heard words like PPBS and systems analysis. This demands that one identify "what" in relation to the programmatic activities and if you are going to relate it to the programmatic activities, then you've got to relate it to the role of the faculty. I would submit that you are going to see a real push on this in the immediate future. To this date it has not been very successful.

The second generalization that I would identify in regard to the present state of the art or science of faculty evaluation is that we have moved much more rapidly in recent years in trying to be explicit in role definition. Often times not in logical relationship to institutional objectives. What I am really saying is, we have tried to develop position descriptions or job descriptions. There is a real problem in this and some people have very mixed feelings about it. How far can you go in being explicit in regard to such a complex and abstract phenomenon as teaching? Many people resent the attempt to reduce teaching to a job description. We have no problem when it comes to a mechanic, the typist, or something of this order. But, when one reduces something like teaching you get a lot of resistence. However, in education we are moving rather rapidly in developing job descriptions. This, it seems to me, can be very helpful in evaluation. Incidentally, this is not all administrator-inspired. A part of

this has developed out of efforts by certain teacher groups--sometimes referred to as "militant,"--in demanding job descriptions as a basis for determinating workload, etc.

The third point I would make in regard to the state of the art is that we have used a variety of standards to measure performance. These may or may not be related to the roles or role expectancies. I have identified six types of standards that have been used.

1. One standard used is "personal background characteristics." We have placed some weight on sex, marital status, health, physical appearance, socio-economic status, and the like. I can show you faculty evaluation forms that take these things into account.
2. We've used performance on tests--intelligence, personality, aptitude, achievement, you name it, we probably have used it one time or the other. We have even used the TAT or Rorschach. The TAT is a highly sophisticated projective technique which is probably best used in the clinical setting as is the Rorschach.
3. We've used the trait approach. I looked over some faculty evaluation schemes today. I saw terms like judgement, initiative, demeanor, leadership, etc. This is the trait approach and is very widely used.
4. We've used academic and professional characteristics--one's training, one's experience, one's professional growth, effort, etc. That is, we've used one's credentials in evaluation after employment.
5. We've used teaching behavior--how one performs in the classroom.
6. We've used quantification of services--number of research grants, number of research proposals, kind of public services, institutional service, classes taught, students advised, service to profession, etc.

The fourth generalization that I would offer is in regard to the means of the gathering evidence. That is, we've used many different kinds of instruments and these have been applied by many different kinds of groups. We've used

professional activities reports, superior's rating, and teaching performance or observation guides (descriptive or evaluative in nature) administered by students, peers, outside observers, and superiors. In a different category, we've used pupil gain. I would call your attention to the fact that we are mixing process and output when we use pupil gain. Also we have the problem of variable control using pupil gain scores.

The next generalization I would offer is that the correlation between and among the several bits of evidence are often low. For example, if you correlate instructor training, pupil's observation of teaching skills, and administrator's observation of teaching skill, the correlation would probably be quite low. This does not bother me, because if the correlation was quite high we would wonder why we are using all the bits of evidence. To me the object is to use factors that are not correlated. Some people get real excited about the low correlations. This, I don't understand. It seems that a low correlation is what one wants, assuming that there are different facets of performance. Also, I would note that correlations with so called criterion measures are low. Let's say you correlate GRE scores with the performance in the graduate program--you will probably get a low correlation. What is interesting about this to me is that when you are looking at the studies, the criterion measures or the dependent variables in one study are often used as independent variables in another study. So I wonder what is really the criterion variable.

The last generalization that I would offer is that the success, which is based primarily on testimonial evidence, of any given scheme appears to be primarily a function of the acceptance of the scheme by the administrators and teachers. (Today one might add students.) From my own point of view when you go back to the kind of standards that have been used, I feel more confident with the teacher behavior and with quantification of services. I may be in error on this. However, with that in mind let me turn to a proposition for your consideration.

A Proposal for Faculty Evaluation. I suppose a wise and prudent man would summarize at this point and say that each institution must develop its own scheme using the best known particitory techniques within the taxonomy identified. However, I am not a particularly wise nor prudent man and I have nothing to lose but my ego, so I'll will go a little further. I am going to offer you a proposal.

Let us start out with some assumptions. First, let's us assume that faculty members have appropriate, at least minimum, professional credentials or you would not have employed them. Now, I don't think administrators can argue with that one, because I could ask you why you employed them.

Second, let's assume that the expectancies associated with the faculty members' roles in a community college involve (a) teaching (including advisement of students), (b) service to the institution (various committee work), (c) public service, and (d) service to the profession. I recognize the need to relate these to institutional objectives. I recognize there may be a difference in configuration within and among the institutions. In other words, the teaching expectancies, service to the public, service to the institution, service to the profession might vary with the classification of faculty employees.

Third, let us assume that faculty and administrators in a given institution can, by the process of negotiation, reach agreement on the relative value of teaching and the several kinds of services for different classes of faculty members. I think it has been demonstrated that college faculty and staff can reach agreement on the relative value of the above four areas. For example, it might be agreed that on a 100 point scale teaching is worth 60 points, service to the organization 15, etc.

Fourth, let us assume that using data supplied by the faculty members concerned, superiors and peers are in the best position to evaluate services. Fifth, let us assume that students--not administrators, not peers--are in the best position to define, identify, and assess good teaching behavior. Given the foregoing assumptions I offer the following proposal.

First, the several services associated with a role should be identified and assigned a total weight. I would argue that the first step is to determine how much services are worth collectively. Let's say they are worth 40 points on a 100-point scale. Then at the same time you are saying teaching is worth 60 points. Thus, we say the role involves 40 points for services and 60 points for teaching.

Second, the several services must each be given a weight within the total points assigned. This is something that would have to be agreed upon by individuals involved. Let's say they agreed on service to the institution is worth 20 points, service to the public or community is worth 10 and professional service is worth 10. This totals 40 points. We would then have to go a step further and determine within each of these categories how much each type of activity is worth.

Once one has decided what services, how much they are worth collectively, how much they are worth by classification, and what different types of activities are to be performed in each of the categories, we are in a position to evaluate on one's service. I would follow a simple procedure in gathering evidence. We would develop an instrument (a faculty service report) consistent with our agreement on services. We would ask each faculty member to complete an annual faculty service report in which he quantifies his service activities. Then within each division of the institution an administrative-faculty committee would review and assign a value to each of the faculty service activities using the agreed upon weights.

Let us turn to teaching. Since I have assumed that students are in the best position to judge teaching, I obviously must leave this to them. Before specifying, how, let me note six things.

First, there is some evidence to indicate that there is really little correlation between student ratings of faculty and grades. Many people fear student rating because they believe that there is a relationship. The Remmers

study, the Hudelson study, among others show correlations of .07 and .19. Second, there is no significant relationship between ratings and such factors as class size, sex of students, college year, whether the course is elective or required (Goldhartz). Third, there is little correlation between the attitude toward the instructor per se and rating of the instructor's performance in the class (Hays). Fourth, between-rater correlations are high--on the order of .85 to .89 (Guthrie). Fifth, it has been demonstrated by Whitlock that the employment of "performance specimens" and overall student evaluation represents a power function. In other words, there is a straight line relationship between E/I observations and overall rating. By E/I observations I simply mean the number of effective performance specimens (E) demonstrated by the person in relation to the number of ineffective specimens (I).

Sixth, in the usual approach of having students evaluate faculty on some type of rating scale (e.g. dissatisfied-satisfied) with a number of externally imposed factors (e.g. coming to class well prepared, pleasing personality, etc.) You get high intercorrelations among the ratings on the individual factors (halo effect).

Considering the foregoing, in developing an instrument for students to use in assessing teaching performance, I would use a "performance specimen" approach. Simply stated this procedure is as follows:

1. You go to a large number of classes in your institution, ask two questions, and get written responses. The first question is this: "Think of the last time you saw one of your instructors do *something* in or out of class such that when he did it you said to yourself, 'This is an example of uncommonly good teaching.'" Ask the student to write down what he recalls and if he doesn't recall anything, then forget it. Ask the same question, but substitute the words, "uncommonly poor teaching." This is the first step in collecting performance specimens. You'll probably want to collect about 500 specimens in this manner.

2. Edit these responses, eliminate duplications, and get the number down to manageable size.
3. Interview, individually, a group of students asking the same questions. Keep interviewing until you don't get any new specimens. History has shown that this will take between 20-30 interviews.
4. Take what you collected via the group method and via the individual interviews and develop a checklist. Your checklist will obviously consist of a series of performance specimens that the students have given you. Some of these will be examples of what the students have reported to be uncommonly good teaching and others will be examples of uncommonly poor teaching. The former I will label "E" and the latter I will label "I."
5. Give the checklist to a sample of students with the instructions to "recall the last class you have attended--check all the instances on this instrument which you have observed with that instructor during this term. If you don't immediately recall any, don't check them." The student is doing no rating--that's the point I want to make--he is not rating. He is simply going down the specimen checklist and checking off specimens (either this did occur or did not occur). At the bottom of the checklist set up an overall global scale of effectiveness. "How would you rate this professor? A, B, C, D, or F?" Get a sample of three or four hundred of these.
6. Take the top and bottom group using first, overall evaluation. Say, take the "A's" and compare them with the "F's." Then take the E/I ratios and compare, say, the top and bottom 27%. By top 27% I am talking about the checklists that have the highest E/I ratio. In other words, the greatest number of "E's" to the smallest number of "I's." Use some simple technique such as Chi-square, to determine which of the performance specimens discriminate between extremes both in

terms of the global scale and high and low E/I ratios. Use those specimens that are significant. This will give you a checklist that your students have said represents performance of uncommonly good and uncommonly poor teaching. The instrument is a wholly significant one. In your checklist you should have some 50-60 items.

In using such a checklist in evaluating teaching--remember I said this to me is only one aspect of instructor competence--I would simply go into a sample of each instructor's classes each term and have the students complete the checklist. These data would, in turn, be converted to average E/I ratios for each instructor. This in turn will be converted into the total assessment scheme for instructor competence. For example, if teaching is to get 60 points on a scale of 100 and I have an E/I ratio of 18+, I might get 60 points. On the other hand, if my E/I ratio is .5 or less, I might get 3 points. (History shows that high E/I ratios run somewhere between 18 and 20. That is the upper range. In the lower range it is less than 1.)

I won't defend my weights at all, I am merely using them to illustrate the point. I think each institutional staff has to decide this. I recognize that the basic scheme may have to be varied with "class of the faculty member" and that there may be another class of expectancies in your institution. For example, you might want to put value on publications and on efforts to improve. You mignt question the overall value placed on services. Doesn't the person who serves on a lot of committees get a lot of points? That's right. But then how do you get on the committees in your institution? It is usually administrative appointment or faculty selection. Recognition by peers and/or recognition by administrators appears to be an important consideration in colleges. You don't normally select poor people for your committees.

In summary, I am proposing a scheme for faculty evaluation which focuses on performance in relation to expectancies associated with role. Hopefully the expectancies would be an outgrowth of institutional goals. I would not focus on "pre-conditioners" such as traits, test scores, academic background, etc. I would argue that it's what one does, not what ones credentials say that is important. Back to an assumption--if a person did not have the credentials he would not have been hired in the first place. Second, I am arguing that the scheme ought to involve students, superiors, peers, and the instructors in question--I think this scheme will do it. Third, I am arguing that it ought to be relatively simple--this is not a complicated scheme to follow. Fourth, I am arguing that it should be both quantitative and qualitative--quality in regard to teaching and quantity in regard to services performed.

ABSTRACT

Measuring Faculty Performance
by
Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer

This monograph, prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, and available through the American Association of Junior Colleges is an attempt on the part of Cohen and Brawer to answer two basic questions: (1) Why study teachers? and (2) How best to study teaching?

Initially the authors review rating techniques now in use in a variety of institutions. (See forms in use in Florida elsewhere in these working papers) They point out that many if not most evaluation procedures judge the teacher as a person, or they judge teachers' performance. Few rating schemes examine the effect of teaching on learners. Other problems reviewed in relation to rating are: (1) establishing criteria related to the objectives of the junior college; (2) Bias of the rater tending towards inconsistent ratings of individual instructors or overly consistent ratings between faculty members; (3) Pre-established criteria having little relationship to teaching effectiveness, i.e. ratings by degree held, contracts and grants, experience, etc. The authors note that rating by colleagues, student evaluations, and even self-evaluation suffer from these weaknesses.

Cohen and Brawer review a series of studies relating teacher effectiveness to personality variables. Most of these studies apparently suffer from (a) a lack of independent criteria and (b) a lack of applicability to the general situation. Those that are not weak in these areas may suffer from a lack of replicability, insufficient substantiating research, or a lack of carefully defined goals and objectives upon which to base independent variables.

The authors review in depth a study of the evaluation of teaching interns through UCLA on a series of demographic and psychological variables. They conclude that although "successful" teachers may be highly diverse in relation to these variables, such examination may help in selecting new teachers who will be successful. But, success in this study related directly to supervisor ratings. The proglems with such ratings that were reviewed earlier are no less valid in this study.

In discussing the reasons for measuring faculty performance, the authors again emphasize the ambiguity of purpose and poorly defined criteria upon which most evaluations are based. One major reason for evaluating faculty that was cited was "to improve instructions" but methods used seldom relate to instruction or its results. Although it would be difficult to fault the objective of "improving instruction," most evaluation schemes have little to do with such improvement.

Other reasons often used for evaluation of faculty may be the administrator's tendency to judge his faculty as faculty judge students, or even tradition; faculty have been evaluated in the past therefore they should continue to be evaluated.

Perhaps a more valid reason for evaluating teaching is the teachers' own claim that they are professionals. If they are, they must "police their own profession to counter external judgement."

Evaluation can, in fact, help to direct faculty efforts where they are needed most. It can work to improve instruction. The effects of the instructional environment must be included in any evaluation scheme.

The ultimate criteria of any evaluation must be measurable changes in students, including both short-and long-range changes. Teacher personality and behavior measures can be valid only in their relation to student growth. The problems in assessing such growth while large, are not insurmountable. Every effort should be made to remove extraneous variables so that some measure of the effect of instruction upon student growth may be derived.

The authors suggest that perhaps a system of supervision tied in with evaluation may hold promise. Cohen and Brawer emphasize that the main purpose of the junior college is superior instruction. If instruction is to be worthwhile, it must be evaluated. The ultimate criteria for such evaluation must be student growth.

EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts has worked with 80 graduate students whom he had exposed to extensive classroom experiences in the affective domain vis-a-vis the cognitive domain (see Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Vol. I and II.). After seminars on teacher and course evaluation the 80 students (from three graduate Higher Education courses) made 160 attempts at designing an instrument for evaluating teacher effectiveness and course effectiveness in a course conducted in the affective domain. Three instruments were prepared from the best of the individual attempts.

Effectiveness of these instruments is being tested currently.

Form No. 1

SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING

Instructor _____ Course _____

Listed below are several qualities which describe aspects of instructor behavior. Grade your instructor on each of these items by drawing a circle around the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Grade each item as thoughtfully and carefully as possible. Do NOT omit items.

		A (Outstanding)	B (Superior)	C (Competent)	D (Fair)	F (Poor)
1.	Effectively interprets abstract ideas and theories	4	3	2	1	0
2.	Gets me interested in his subject	4	3	2	1	0
3.	Has increased my skills in thinking	4	3	2	1	0
4.	Has helped broaden by interests	4	3	2	1	0
5.	Stresses important materials.....	4	3	2	1	0
6.	Makes good use of examples and illustrations	4	3	2	1	0
7.	Has motivated me to do my best work	4	3	2	1	0
8.	Inspires class confidence in his knowledge of subject	4	3	2	1	0
9.	Has given me new viewpoints or appreciations	4	3	2	1	0
10.	Is clear and understandable in his explanations	4	3	2	1	0
11.	Has been well prepared for each day's presentation	4	3	2	1	0
12.	Has an adequate speaking voice	4	3	2	1	0
13.	Is willing to give individual attention	4	3	2	1	0
14.	Includes in his presentations worthwhile and informative material not duplicated in text	4	3	2	1	0

15.	Makes challenging assignments..	4	3	2	1	0
16.	Has a good sense of humor	4	3	2	1	0
17.	Is fair in grading	4	3	2	1	0
18.	Presents thought-provoking ideas	4	3	2	1	0
19.	Has given me new methods for solving problems	4	3	2	1	0
20.	Shows respect for questions and opinions of students	4	3	2	1	0
21.	Keeps me informed as to my progress	4	3	2	1	0

Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he has done especially well in his teaching of this course _____

_____

_____

_____

Your instructor would also like to know what specific things you believe might be done to improve his teaching of this course _____

_____

_____

Thus far your judgments have been restricted to characteristics of the teacher himself. For the items below indicate your feeling for the subject matter of the course by checking (x) the appropriate entry.

The subject matter or content of the course is: Highly interesting _____
Moderately interesting _____
Not very interesting _____

What question would you have liked to answer that you did not get a chance to answer on this evaluation?

What rating would you assign to your answer on this question? _____

_____

Form No. 2

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Work Characteristics

Innovator/creator - new methods are attempted, creative approach is encouraged

Planner/projector - plans ahead as part of procedure, projections for officer and area are apparent

Facilitator - can carry out job, gets things done

Self-starter - Self-directed, works without supervision but can and will consult with others

Team worker/cooperator - considers self part of total team efforts

Leader - offers leadership to college in his area of competence

Communicator/sharer - communicates effectively with colleagues and shares progress and plans of his area with others for good of entire college program

Decision maker - makes effective decisions using good judgment without dependence

Utilizer of resources - makes best use of resources within and without the institution

Supporter of college/community - supports the college and the community with genuine concern and appreciation

Supervisor/manager of people - supervises effectively and manages affairs of area with cooperation of all, able to engender high morale

Professional Characteristics

Professional growth - takes steps to improve self in area of competence and to know as much about new trends in area as possible

Professional contributions - contributions to profession at state and local levels through participation in educational activity

Personal Characteristics

Attitude - has positive attitude toward job and people, is enthusiastic about work, enthusiasm is reflected in relationship with others

Loyalty - is loyal to institution and to profession

Accepts criticism - can accept criticism from supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates

Appearance - represents college in manner of dress as professional person

Integrity - is honest in relationship to others, has highest professional ethics

Dependability - will deliver project as proposed when it is requested

Form No. 3

CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

Instructor Evaluated _____ Date _____

Department _____ Course _____

1. Outstanding
2. Above Average
3. Satisfactory
4. Needs Improvement
5. Unsatisfactory

ITEM	RATING 1	2	3	4	5	REMARKS
1. Organization						
2. Evidence of preparation						
3. Mastery of subject						
4. Presentation: Mechanics Methods Used						
5. Enthusiasm						
6. Student Involvement						
7. Overall effectiveness						

What positive points were noted?

What negative points were noted?

Teacher's Signature

Evaluator's Signature

Form No. 4

STUDENT EVALUATION REPORT

Instructor Evaluated _____ Name & Section of Course _____ Date _____

PURPOSE: The purpose of this report is to aid the teacher in improving his or her instruction. Your comments in the appropriate spaces are solicited.

	ABOVE AVERAGE	SATIS-FACTORY	NEEDS IMPROVE-MENT	COMMENTS
Command of subject matter				
Ability to relate subject matter to the student				
Ability to create and hold interest in the classroom				
Ability to organize presentation				
Ability to encourage student participation through mutual respect, and intelligent acceptance of differences of opinion				
Enthusiasm (as shown in and out the classroom--for teaching and subject matter				

What strengths were noted, if any?

What weaknesses were noted, if any?

What annoying habits or mannerisms were noted, if any?

Form No. 5

Name_____ Date_____

I. INSTRUCTION RELATED ACTIVITIES	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
A. In Classroom or On-Job Activities					
1. Knowledge of subject	___	___	___	___	___
2. Interest in subject	___	___	___	___	___
3. Ability to relate to other areas	___	___	___	___	___
4. Preparation of material	___	___	___	___	___
5. Presentation of material	___	___	___	___	___
6. Class attitudes	___	___	___	___	___
7. Grading Standards	___	___	___	___	___
8. Punctuality	___	___	___	___	___
B. Out of Classroom					
1. Adequate training and background	___	___	___	___	___
2. Service on committees	___	___	___	___	___
3. Compliance with established policies	___	___	___	___	___
4. Extracruuicula relationship with students	___	___	___	___	___
5. Departmental contributions	___	___	___	___	___
6. Initiation	___	___	___	___	___
7. Completion and return of reports and forms	___	___	___	___	___
8. Punctuality (work hours, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___

II. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL RELATED ACTIVITIES					
A. Personal					
1. Appearance and grooming	___	___	___	___	___
2. Voice control	___	___	___	___	___
3. Health and alertness	___	___	___	___	___
4. Enthusiasm	___	___	___	___	___
5. Emotional control	___	___	___	___	___
6. Sense of humor	___	___	___	___	___
B. Community					
1. Civic work	___	___	___	___	___
2. Ethical standards	___	___	___	___	___
3. Moral standards	___	___	___	___	___
4. Professional conduct	___	___	___	___	___

I do ( ) do not ( ) recommend this faculty member be re-employed for the _____ academic year.

I do ( ) do not ( ) recommend this faculty member for promotions when appropriate opportunities exist.

I do ( ) do not ( ) recommend this faculty member for continuing contract.

Department Head Division Head Dean

Form No. 6

The faculty of _____ endeavor to present their course material in an interesting, factual, and comprehensible manner. Your thoughts concerning the course, instructor and instruction will be a valuable aid to the faculty in their instruction. A recent study of questionnaire returns by the Michigan University Research Center on Learning and Teaching states that "if as many as 25 students rate a teacher, the results are as reliable as our better educational and mental tests." CONSTRUCTIVELY CRITICIZE FOR BETTER COURSES.

_____ _____

INSTRUCTOR COURSE SECTION

Please add your own comments whenever appropriate. IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.

1. GENERAL

   Without judging the effectiveness of the instructor, please comment on the intrinsic interest of the subject matter.

   a. ( ) I like the subject very much.
      ( ) I like the subject fairly well.
      ( ) I neither like nor dislike the subject.
      ( ) I dislike the subject.
      ( ) I strongly dislike the subject.

   b. Have you had other courses in this subject? Yes __ No __

2. INSTRUCTOR'S KNOWLEDGE OF HIS COURSE
   ( ) Usually able to discuss freely and with great clarity material in this and related fields.
   ( ) Has thorough grasp of this field and little knowledge of related fields.
   ( ) Unable to discuss intelligibly many of the items vitally important to the subject-matter of the course.
   ( ) This item does not apply.

3. BIAS--OBJECTIVITY

   When there are conflicting theories in a field, does the instructor present all sides of the point in question? My instructor is:
   ( ) Always intolerant of any theoretical point of view but his own.
   ( ) Sometimes open-minded and rarely intolerant.
   ( ) Usually open-minded and rarely intolerant.
   ( ) Always open-minded.
   ( ) This item does not apply.

4. DAILY PREPARATION

   Does the teacher conduct his hour in a manner that reflects preparation and planning?
   ( ) Almost always.
   ( ) Usually.
   ( ) About half the time.
   ( ) Less than half the time.
   ( ) Almost never.

5. A. CLARITY WITH WHICH OBJECTIVES ARE DEFINED AT BEGINNING OF HOUR DOES THE INSTRUCTOR DEFINE HIS OBJECTIVES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE HOUR?

( ) Usually defines these objectives.
( ) About half the time defines these objectives.
( ) Less than half the time defines these objectives.
( ) Never defines these objectives.
( ) This item does not apply.

B. REASONS FOR LACK OF CLARITY

In some parts of this course the presentation may have been unclear. Check any reasons for such lack of clarity due to the way in which your instructor has presented the course materials. (You may check more than one.)

( ) This item does not apply.
( ) Order of presentation was hard to follow.
( ) Steps in chains of reasoning are characteristically omitted.
( ) Other necessary detail is lacking.
( ) Much irrelevant detail is included.
( ) Theoretical materials not well enough presented to warrant application.
( ) Other reasons. (Specify.)

6. SPEECH AND DELIVERY (MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE.)

( ) Speaks satisfactorily.
( ) Speaks too slowly.
( ) Speaks too rapidly.
( ) Fails to project his voice successfully.
( ) Physical restlessness distracting to student.
( ) Monotonous delivery.

7. FLEXIBILITY

Is the structure of the course flexible and varied to meet the students needs?

( ) Usually.
( ) About half the time.
( ) Less than half the time.
( ) Never.
( ) This item does not apply.

8. A. AMOUNT OF CLASS DISCUSSION

( ) Too much.
( ) Too little
( ) About right.

B. DOES THE INSTRUCTOR STEER DISCUSSION FROM BEING CONCERNED WITH UNIMPORTANT OR IRRELEVANT MATTERS?

( ) Usually.
( ) About half the time.
( ) Less than half the time.
( ) Almost never.
( ) This item does not apply.

9. INSTRUCTOR'S REACTION TO STUDENTS' QUESTIONS
   ( ) Usually grasps meaning of questions, and presents clear and complete answers to them.
   ( ) Usually understands questions, but fails to give helpful answers.
   ( ) Usually had difficulty in understanding questions.

10. AVAILABILITY FOR CONSULTATION OUTSIDE CLASSROOM:
   ( ) Always available.
   ( ) Usually available.
   ( ) Sometimes difficult, but usually possible to arrange appointments.
   ( ) Very difficult to arrange appointments.

WILLINGNESS TO ASSIST IN PROBLEMS RELATING TO COURSE.
If I have a problem relating to the course my instructor:
   ( ) Seems definitely annoyed that I wish to discuss it with him.
   ( ) Discusses it with me, but acts as though I am bothering him.
   ( ) Seems willing to discuss it with me.
   ( ) Definitely encourages my discussing such problems with him.

II. EXAMINATIONS (THIS ITEM MAY NOT APPLY. IF IT DOES, CHECK ONE IN EACH CASE.)

A. Frequency:
   ( ) Too few ( ) Too many ( ) About right

B. Ambiguity of questions:
   ( ) Often ambiguous ( ) Occasionally ( ) Usually clear

C. Length:
   ( ) About right ( ) Too long ( ) Too short

D. Difficulty:
   ( ) Too elementary ( ) Too difficult ( ) About right

E. Emphasis:
   ( ) Emphasizes less important aspects of course content.
   ( ) Emphasizes more important aspects of course content.

F. Exams returned in reasonable time:
   ( ) Usually ( ) Seldom ( ) No

12. QUANTITY OF ASSIGNMENTS
   ( ) Too much ( ) Too few ( ) About right

13. QUALITY OF ASSIGNMENTS
   ( ) Busywork ( ) Not relative to the course ( ) Satisfactory

14. FAIRNESS IN GRADING
When I receive a grade in a quiz, examination, or paper, I feel that my instructor has given it careful, sincere, and impersonal consideration.
   ( ) Almost always.
   ( ) About half the time.
   ( ) Less than half the time.
   ( ) Almost never.

15. ABILITY TO AROUSE INTEREST
Irrespective of my personal interest in the subject-matter of the course, the class-hour is such that:

( ) I never want to miss it.
( ) I seldom want to miss it.
( ) I could care.
( ) I prefer not to go to it.
( ) I dislike going to it.

16. OVERALL APPRAISAL
Recalling the teachers I have had in college and high school, I would rate my instructor in this course as:

( ) One of the strongest teachers I have had.
( ) A capable teacher.
( ) About average.
( ) Below average.
( ) Among the least successful.

17. What can you suggest to your teacher which would be helpful to him in increasing his effectiveness in this course? BE SPECIFIC.

Form No. 7

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

Name of Person evaluated _____

	Superior	Sat.	Poor
I. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS			
A. Is healthy and emotionally stable	___	___	___
B. Is neat and well groomed in appearance	___	___	___
C. Thinks logically and makes practical decisions	___	___	___
D. Is accurate	___	___	___
E. Is punctual	___	___	___
F. Takes necessary and appropriate action on his own	___	___	___
G. Is dedicated to his profession	___	___	___
II. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHERS			
A. Is respected by students	___	___	___
B. Is responsible and dependable	___	___	___
C. Is friendly, understanding, sympathetic with community, other staff members and administration	___	___	___
D. Is professionally ethical	Yes___	___	No___
E. Shows consideration for students	Yes___	___	No___
III. TEACHING (SKILLS) ABILITY			
A. Knows subject matter	___	___	___
B. Takes action to improve himself	___	___	___
C. Uses instructional materials effectively	___	___	___
D. Develops student interest and eagerness to learn	___	___	___
E. Maintains student control	___	___	___

IV. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS TEACHER FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT:

Yes _____ No _____

___ A. I recommend this instructor be kept on annual contract.

___ B. I do not recommend this instructor to be re-employed.

___ C. I recommend this instructor's status remain unchanged.

___ D. I recommend this instructor be given continuing contract.

V. DID YOU DISCUSS THIS EVALUATION WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER CONCERNED?

Yes _____ No _____

_____ Date

_____ Signature

Form No. 3

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

Note to Evaluator:

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to conduct our periodic evaluation of instruction. We hope that the instructor, the class, and the college will benefit from our asking each student to evaluate his instructor. We would like to hear from your side of the desk.

Note to Students:

Please follow directions closely in order that there need be no questions and we can finish quickly. You will be allowed 5 minutes.
When you are finished fold the paper once, then hand it to me.
Only the President, the Dean of Instruction, and the appropriate division chairman will see the results. Your comments will be typed before the instructor sees them to assure complete anonymity.

Course Prefix_____ Section_____ Instructor_____

FOR EACH OF THE FOUR ROWS (A-D) PLACE A CHECK MARK IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX.

	Excellent 5	Good 4	Aver. 3	Below Av. 2	Poor 1	Comments
A. PERSONAL TRAITS (enthusiasm, attitude, judgment, sense of humor)						
B. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT						
C. CLASS PRESENTATION (planning, skill, ability to make subject clear)						
D. EVALUATION OF STUDENTS (accuracy, fairness)						

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (use reverse side if necessary)

Form No. 9

DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

PURPOSE: The students and faculty are interested in the continuing improvement of instruction. This is accomplished partially through the efforts of each instructor to improve his classroom procedure. This improvement can be attained only when the instructor is aware of the quality of his performance. This awareness can best be acquired from student performance and reaction. It is for this purpose students are being given the opportunity to take an active part in improving the academic standards of our College by evaluating their instructors. Therefore, please make the responses conscientiously and individually.

NOTE: After the final grades are recorded, the entire packet of cards and compilation sheets will be forwarded to the instructor for his use in improving his classroom procedures and teaching techniques.

1. You should have:
   a. the mimeographed evaluation form
   b. a blank IBM card
   c. a testing pencil
   d. a blank 8-1/2 x 11 sheet of paper

2. Print in ink on the reverse side of the IBM card:
   a. the name of your instructor
   b. the name of the course (i.e. Eng. Comp. 101-3)
   c. the sequence number of the course

3. Do not make any marks on the mimeographed evaluation form.

4. Using the testing pencil, fill in the Test Starter Bubble number 1 at the left margin of the IBM card.

5. Fill in the appropriate bubble for each criterion. Selections available are on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest rating. If you are unfamiliar with the particular item, or if it is not applicable to the instructor, then it should be left blank.

6. If you desire to write additional comments (#21)
   a. head your blank sheet with
      (1) name of your instructor (2) the name of the course
   b. write your comments. Your signature is not necessary.

7. At the completion, hand in your IBM card, the mimeographed form, the comment sheet, and the testing pencil.

NOTE TO THE STUDENT ADMINISTRATOR:

1. Check each IBM card to insure that it has the proper endorsement on the reverse side, the starter bubble is filled in, and only one number is marked per criterion. The usual completed white Instructor's Header Card must be included.

2. Place IBM cards in the provided envelope and seal.
3. Collect the comment sheets and place them in the manilla envelope to be given to the instructor.
4. Collect the mimeographed forms, testing pencils, and blank sheets to return to the instructor.
5. Take the IBM card envelope to Data Systems.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

ITEM	LOW 1	2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Achieves aims and purposes of the course.	____	____	____	____	____
2. Is well-organized in presentation of material.	____	____	____	____	____
3. Stimulates my interest in the subject matter.	____	____	____	____	____
4. Adjusts his pace to the needs of the class.	____	____	____	____	____
5. Allows expression for different points of view from students.	____	____	____	____	____
6. Restrains students who ask irrelevant and disruptive questions.	____	____	____	____	____
7. Exercises sufficient control to prevent cheating on exams.	____	____	____	____	____
8. Has a pleasant attitude in class.	____	____	____	____	____
9. Speaks clearly.	____	____	____	____	____
10. Answers questions clearly.	____	____	____	____	____
11. Gives sufficient directions to help me learn.	____	____	____	____	____
12. Makes assignments clearly.	____	____	____	____	____
13. Makes reasonable assignments.	____	____	____	____	____
14. Returns graded material within reasonable time.	____	____	____	____	____
15. Makes oral or written comments on my work so as to help me.	____	____	____	____	____

	1	2	3	4	5
16. Explains method and basis for grading work.	____	____	____	____	____
17. Grades fairly.	____	____	____	____	____
18. Expects me to perform to the best of my ability.	____	____	____	____	____
19. Is available to me for assistance out of class.	____	____	____	____	____
20. Meets class regularly.	____	____	____	____	____

21. Further comment on separate sheet. Print if desired. (Optional)

Form No. 10

STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION (Code ____)

1. General Information
   ____ age
   ____ Quality point average
   ____ expected grade in this course
   ____ field of concentration

2. Why are you taking this course? (Check as many as apply.)
   ____ required
   ____ fit well in schecule
   ____ heard the professor was good
   ____ heard the course was easy
   ____ had genuine interest in learning about the subject

3. Do you prepare
   ____ daily assignments?
   ____ supplementary reading?
   ____ independent work?
   ____ anything at all for class?

4. Considering this course in relation to the others you are taking, do you feel that time spent in preparation is
   ____ enough?
   ____ too little?
   ____ too much?

   Comment:

5. Do you participate voluntarily in class discussion
   ____ frequently?
   ____ occasionally?
   ____ never?

6. If you do not understand the lecture or discussion, do you
   ____ ignore it?
   ____ seek an explanation?

7. Do you look up minor points and unfamiliar words instead of taking up class time to ask about them? Yes___; No___.

8. Do you tend to monopolize discussion? Yes___; No___.

9. Do you attempt to make relationships
   ____between old and new material within the course?
   ____between this course and others you have taken?

10. Are you getting as much as you anticipated from this course? Yes___; No___.
Comment:

COMMENTS: If you have any suggestions concerning the improvement of this questionnaire or the course evaluation program, please write them below. Thank you.

11. Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he has done especially well in his teaching of this course.

12. Your instructor would also like to know what specific things you believe might be done to improve his teaching of this course

13. Your instructor would like to know what you believe to be the strong or outstanding elements and values in this course.

14. Your instructor would also like to know what you believe to be the weak or unimportant elements in this course.

Form No. 11

PLAN FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

The implementation of the new salary scale requires a system of faculty evaluation. The plan entails two categories of salary increases. The first are granted as annual increments on the basis of years of service to those receiving an evaluation of good or better; the second are given in recognition of outstanding quality of service to those receiving rating of very good or superior.

The following plan is presented for your consideration as the system to be used in this evaluation.

GENERAL PLAN

Each member of the faculty will be evaluated annually by his chairman of department, supervisor, or committee. This rating will be based upon: (a) knowledge of the individual's work, (b) observation of the individual's classes, (c) the student ratings of the instructor, (d) the individual's self rating, and (e) any other pertinent data. This evaluation will then be submitted to a committee composed of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the appropriate dean, and the chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Any individual who prefers to be rated by a committee rather than by the chairman of his department or his supervisor alone may request this evaluation procedure as suggested below under Supplementary Plan. This request must be made prior to the chairman's or supervisor's evaluation. (Date due to be specified.)

Any individual who disagrees with the rating given him by the chairman of his department or his supervisor may request an evaluation by a special committee, the operation of which is explained below under Supplementary Plan.

Each department head or supervisor will be evaluated annually by his dean or immediate administrative superior. This rating will be based upon: (a) knowledge of the individual's work, (b) observation of the individual's work, (c) the department head or supervisor's self rating, (d) the evaluation of the department head or supervisor by members of his department, and (e) any other pertinent data.

PROCEDURE FOR MAKING THE EVALUATION

At a fixed date each year all members of the faculty will fill out two self-evaluation forms. The first will go to the chairman of department or supervisor. The second, a more detailed form designed for self-improvement, will be for the individual's personal use only.

At some time near the end of the fall term all students will fill out questionnaires regarding the work of the instructor of each course they are taking.

These ratings will be handled by the appropriate chairman or supervisor, who will see that they are analyzed by data processing and that composite student evaluations are prepared for each class. The chairman or supervisor will make a copy of this report available to each individual instructor in his department.

The chairman of department, supervisor, or committee will use these two analyses as aids in preparing a detailed evaluation report of the faculty member. This evaluation will be based on an instrument containing a numerical scale. Each individual will be rated as: deficient, good, very good, or superior. When the rating is deficient, very good, or superior, an explanation of the basis for the rating will be included in the report.

The chairman of department or supervisor will hold a conference with each individual being evaluated at the request of the evaluee to discuss the rating with him.

This evaluation will be turned in to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

In case an individual faculty member prefers to be graded by a committee rather than by his chariman of department or his supervisor alone, or in case he disagrees with the evaluation given him by the latter, he may request the Faculty Affairs Committee to set up for him a faculty evaluating committee. This committee will be composed of three members: (a) a faculty member named by the individual under consideration, (b) the chairman of his department or supervisor, and (c) a third faculty member named by the first two. (In case (a) is not a member of the same department as the person to be evaluated, then the third member must be from the same department. In case this is an appeal committee, the department chairman or supervisor will appoint a faculty member to replace him.)

Each member of the committee will observe the individual's teaching or work and prepare his own evaluation report. If the instructor so desires, he may set additional specific times for visitations.

The committee's evaluation will be based upon an analysis of: (a) their individual ratings, (b) the composite student ratings, (c) the faculty member's self-evaluation, and (d) any other pertinent information.

The committee will then hold a conference with the person being evaluated at the request of the evaluee to discuss with him the basis for his rating.

The committee's evaluation will be turned in to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(Note: The Faculty Affairs Committee will provide special forms for: (a) the student rating scale for instructors, (b) self-evaluation sheets for instructors and chairmen of departments or supervisors, and (c) the forms to be utilized by chairmen of departments or supervisors in making evaluations of faculty members.)

Staff Member's Self-Evaluation

Your evaluation of your work can provide valuable data for the person or committee evaluating you. To aid him (or them), please give a descriptive analysis of the following points:

I. What objectives do you attempt to realize in the courses you teach?
II. What methods do you utilize in helping students to achieve these goals?
III. What do you consider to be the most significant evidences of the success of your work?
IV. In your opinion, what is exceptional about your work and what makes you eligible for a salary increment based upon special merit?

Turn in your signed, dated report to your chairman, supervisor, or the chairman of your evaluation committee.

STAFF EVALUATION FORM

NAME_____ DIVISION_____
DATE_____ DEPARTMENT_____

The points below provide a detailed check list to help in judging some of the important aspects of the work of a member of your staff. As all items have a rating roughly equivalent to superior, very good, good and deficient, the list may provide a broad base for determining your total evaluation. Check the description under each item that corresponds closest to your evaluation. In some cases it may not be necessary to mark all items because some of them may not apply to the work of the staff member under consideration; others may cover details for which you lack the evidence to form a judgment.

I. Professional Qualifications

1. Educational and Experience:

____Superior knowledge and ability for all phases of the work
____Very good qualifications for most phases of the work
____Satisfactory knowledge and ability for routine aspects of the work
____Serious gaps in his knowledge of the field

2. Self-Improvement:
____Consistently undertakes significant programs to increase his knowledge and experience; well-informed on latest development in his field
____Shows initiative to improve the breadth and depth of his knowledge and experience
____Takes steps occasionally to increase his training and experience
____Upgrades skills and competencies only when specifically required to do so

3. Attitude toward College:
____Creative, positive and active in support of college policies
____Active in support of college policies
____Loyal to college but not always positive in support of policies
____Sometimes negatively critical of policies without helping to improve them

II. Effectiveness of Instruction

1. Objectives of Courses

(Consider whether or not his objectives are: (1) well defined, (2) similar to those of the department and college for the given area and (3) clearly explained to the students. Is the work of the course organized to help students meet these objectives?)

____Superior
____Very good
____Good
____Deficient

2. Organization of Subject Matter:
____Superior
____Systematic and well organized
____Adequate, but could be improved
____Inadequate or unsystematic

3. Preparation for Class:
____Always careful
____Usually careful
____Average
____Sometimes inadequate

4. Development of skills:
____Succeeds in helping a majority of his students to improve the skills required for the course
____Attempts to help the majority of his students
____Gives his attention to the development of skills and helps some students
____Gives inadequate attention to skills

5. Development of the Students' Understanding of the Basic Concepts and Data of the Course:
____Outstandingly successful in helping most students
____Very good in helping most students
____Average in helping most students
____Deficient in providing understanding for most students

6. Encouragement of Critical Thinking:
(Consider the instructor's ability to stimulate students (1) to study different interpretations of material, situations and problems, (2) to develop their own evaluations and solutions, and (3) to question their ideas and to find evidence to support them.)

_____Superior
_____Very good
_____Good
_____Deficient

7. Verbal Communication:

_____Communicates ideas with exceptional clarity
_____Expresses ideas consistently and clearly
_____Expresses ideas satisfactorily
_____Fails to express ideas and directions clearly

8. Concern for Student Progress:

_____Diagnoses individual problems and gives considerable attention to helping students improve
_____Encourages students to come to him for extra help
_____Gives individual attention when it is requested
_____Avoids individual conferences and discourages questions outside of class

9. Motivation of Students:

_____Motivates to a superior degree by (a) helping students to see the intrinsic value and interest of the content and/or activities of the course and (b) discovering the potential of a student and directing him toward the development of his abilities, whatever they may be. (In case one of the above does not apply, cross it out.)
_____Successfully motivates a large proportion of his students
_____Provides some motivation for many students
_____Seems to give little importance to his responsibilities to motivate his students

10. Adherence to Realistic Academic Standards:

_____Superior
_____Very good
_____Good
_____Deficient

11. Grading Practices:
(Consider whether or not this method of grading is clearly defined, properly based, and adequately explained to the students.)

_____Superior
_____Very good
_____Good
_____Deficient

12. Quality of Testing:
____Exceptional because it (1) covers material emphasized in the course and (2) provides a check on the students' progress in meeting the objectives set by the instructor or the department
____Very good for the above reasons
____Average for the above reasons
____Deficient because it frequently is (1) not well related to the objectives of the course, (2) unfair in that it covers unimportant or irrelevant material, or (3) confusing because questions are vague or ambiguous

13. Student Reaction to Instructor:
____Average reactions superior
____Average reactions very good
____Average reactions good
____Average reactions not good

14. Attendance and Punctuality:
____Superior
____Very good
____Average
____Deficient

III. Effectiveness as a Member of the Faculty Group

1. Initiative:
____Demonstrates outstanding initiative in seeking ways to improve his courses and/or the work of his department or the college
____Demonstrates above average initiative on the above points
____Shows some initiative
____Needs direction in his work

2. Responsibility:
____Consistently demonstrates outstanding initiative in the assumption and discharge of responsibility
____Demonstrates a high degree of initiative on the above points
____Assumes and discharges some responsibility
____Fails to assume, accept or discharge responsibility

3. Cooperation:
____Is exceptionally successful in working with others and actively promotes harmony
____Works in harmony with others as a good team member
____Gets along with others under normal circumstances
____Is ineffective working with others

IV. Total Rating

____Superior
____Very Good
____Good
____Deficient

Ratings of superior and deficient must be supported. (This report may be written on the back of this form or on a separate sheet.)

Date_____ Signed: _____
Chairman of Department
Supervisor
Member of Evaluation Committee
(Cross out the descriptions which do not apply)

EVALUATION SCORE REPORT FORM

	Total	Score possible	Earned
I. Professional Qualifications	9		____
II. Effectiveness of Instruction	42		____
III. Effectiveness as a member of the faculty group	9		____
TOTAL	60		_____

Rating

Superior: 54 through 60
Very Good: 40 through 53
Good: 20 through 39
Deficient: 0 through 19

Form No. 12

STUDENT'S RATING SCALE FOR INSTRUCTORS

Instructor's Name_____ Term_____ _____
Class & Section

This survey is being conducted as a part of a program for evaluating the quality of instruction given. Your ratings on the points listed below will be utilized to prepare composite rating scales for each class. These will be used to assist each instructor in improving his teaching. Your honest judgments are needed if the survey is to provide practical benefits.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME OR OTHERWISE IDENTIFY YOURSELF ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE OR THE IBM CARD.

Directions for Filling Out the IBM Card: Blacken carefully with a Mark-Sense pencil the space which best describes the work of the instructor or the course on the point under consideration. For example, with Item #2, if you consider the instructor exceptionally enthusiastic, you would blacken space 1. Only one space can be marked on each of the nineteen items because the computer will prepare composite ratings; only the first bubble marked will be recorded. If you feel unqualified to give any evaluation on any item or if the question does not apply to your course, then blacken the space -NOT ABLE TO RATE.

1. Objectives of the Course:

   1. The objectives were well-defined and clearly explained; the work of the course was organized to help me achieve these goals
   2. The objectives were well defined and clearly explained, but the main part of the course was not focused toward helping students achieve these goals
   3. Vague objectives were indicated in part of the work
   4. No evidence of objectives was apparent
   5. Unable to rate

2. Attitude toward Subject:

   1. Exceptionally enthusiastic - interest contagious
   2. Enthusiastic, enjoys teaching
   3. Rather interested
   4. Not interested
   5. Unable to rate

3. Organization of Subject Matter:

   1. Always careful
   2. Usually careful
   3. Average
   4. Sometimes inadequate
   5. Unable to rate

4. Development of Skills:

1. Gave considerable attention to the development of skills and helped me make a big improvement
2. Gave attention to the development of skills and helped me to produce some improvement
3. Attempted to help a majority of students to improve their skills
4. Gave inadequate attention to skills
5. Unable to rate

5. Ability to Explain:

1. Explanations exceptionally vivid
2. Explanations clear and to the point
3. Explanations usually adequate
4. Explanations inadequate
5. Unable to rate

6. Encouragement of Thinking:

(To what extent did the instructor help you: (1) to study different interpretations of situations and problems, (2) to develop your own ideas and evaluations, (3) to question your own ideas and to search for evidence to support them?)

1. Was exceptionally stimulating in these areas
2. Definitely encouraged me to think for myself
3. Provided some stimulation to thinking
4. Did not require much thinking
5. Unable to rate

7. Concern for Student Progress:

1. Diagnosed my problems in the course and gave me considerable help to improve
2. Encouraged students to come to him for extra help
3. Gave individual help when it was requested
4. Avoided conferences and discouraged students from asking questions outside of class
5. Unable to rate

2

8. Motivation of Students:

1. Gave me a very strong desire to study by (1) showing me the value of the course and/or (2) helping me to see my own abilities and thus desire to develop them
2. Was successful in getting me to study the subject more than I had done before
3. Attempted to help the class understand why we should work more
4. Gave little attention to motivation
5. Unable to rate

9. Academic Standards of Course:

1. Very high - required a considerable amount of thorough, difficult work
2. High - involved steady application and careful study
3. Average - required a moderate amount of work
4. Low - demanded little real effort
5. Unable to rate

10. Appropriateness of System for Grading:

1. Exceptionally appropriate for the course
2. Very good
3. Good
4. Inappropriate
5. Unable to rate

11. Explanation of Grading System:

1. Superior
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Deficient
5. Unable to rate

12. Quality of Testing:

(Consider: To what extent did important tests cover materials emphasized in the course? To what extent were questions clear, specific, vague or ambiguous? Feel free to comment below.)

1. Superior
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Deficient

13. Honesty of Class:

1. No cheating
2. Some cheating
3. Much cheating
4. Not able to rate

14. Attitude toward Students:

1. Courteous and considerate
2. Too critical
3. Too sarcastic
4. Not able to rate

15. Speaking Ability:

1. Voice and diction excellent
2. Adequate
3. Poor delivery detracts from course
4. Unable to rate

16. Sense of Humor and Seriousness:

1. Well balanced
2. Over-serious
3. Excessively humorous
4. Unable to rate

17. Punctuality in Starting Classes:

1. Usually in class on time
2. Usually late to class

18. Punctuality in Ending Classes:

1. Usually dismissed on time
2. Frequently dismissed early
3. Frequently dismisses late
4. Not able to rate

19. Personal Mannerisms:

1. Wholly free from annoying mannerisms
2. Occasional objectionable mannerisms - Please comment below
3. Frequently exhibits irritating mannerisms - Please comment below
4. Constantly exhibits irritating mannerisms - Please comment below

Comments:

Your comments upon any aspects of the work and especially upon the following questions will be appreciated. What specific benefits did you derive from the course? How might it be improved? What might the instructor have done to have made the course more valuable to you? (Continue your comments on the back of this page.)

Form No. 13

INDIVIDUAL ANNUAL REPORT

Name _____ Rank: (Circle) I II IIa III
Date of first appointment to faculty _____
Number of full-time* years at (College) _____
*Full-time equivalent service for three or more terms within a fiscal year (July 1 - June 30)
Have you held continuing contract elsewhere in Florida?____ If so, where?_____
Assignment: Academic Affairs___ Student Affairs ____ Business Affairs ___ President___

The purpose of this report is to maintain an accurate record of the activities and services of the members of the faculty. Please include all activities which you feel should be recorded. Use extra pages where adequate space is not provided. List other activities not called for but which should become a part of this report. PLEASE TYPE.

Because the activities of the faculty are varied, this blank must cover many topics. Do not feel that you must have something to report under each item. Use only those items which apply directly to you. We would hope that you would give special attention to Item III.

I. Teaching

A. Courses taught Term___, 19__ - 19__;

1. Credit courses

Name of Course	Catalog Designation	Semester Hours	Clock Hours Per Week	Number in Class

2. Other Course (i.e., non-credit, independent study, short courses, etc.)

Name of Course	Hours Per Week	Number in Class

II. Other Assigned Instructional and/or Counseling Responsibilities (Program Directors, Supervisor of Internships, Supervisor of Student Nurses, Practicum Supervision, Etc.)

Function	Percentage of Time Allotted

III. A. What do you consider have been the points of greatest effectiveness of your educational services?

B. What evidence do you have of student growth and achievement related to your educational service? For example, how have you measured student growth and achievement in your classes, in your counseling relationships, or in your other responsibilities? (Please attach copies of reports, studies, or any other compilation of data you may have, such as student evaluation forms available from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Association.)

C. In what ways do you consider that your service has reflected the aims and objectives of the College? If, for example, your major responsibility is as

an instructor, select one course taught during 19__ - 19__; list your objectives for the course and indicate ways in which your objectives relate to college objectives?

IV. Professional Organizations

Describe any responsibilities you have assumed in state, regional, or national professional organizations. This includes offices held, service on committees, programs, and similar activity.

V. Committees

List college committee assignments for the year.

VI. Special Services

List any special service provided such as short-time consultant work, speeches before lay or professional groups, and the like.

VII. Community Services

List any community activities in which you have participated during the year that you believe should be a part of your record.

VIII. Study for Personal or Professional Improvement

A. List any courses you have taken during this year (April, ___ through March, ____). For what reason(s) did you take these courses? At what college or university were the courses taken?

B. List any workshops, institutes, short course, etc. taken during this academic year. Where attended? For what reason? At whose expense?

C. In what ways have these courses, workshops, and institutes improved your ability in working with students?

IX. Publications

List magazine articles, books, monographs, and other publications. Indicate date and publisher.

X. Research

Indicate research completed or in progress during this academic year. Indicate purpose and any significant findings. Were (Name of College) students and/or staff involved in the project?

XI. Special Projects

List any special activities in which you were engaged during the year, such as school surveys, evaluations, special college or university studies, regional or national studies.

XII. Outside Activities

A. List any professional activities in which you have engaged for remuneration during the year not associated with your responsibilities to the College.

B. Indicate all other activities that you feel should become a part of this report. Include travel and other pertinent experiences.

Form No. 14

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Course:_____ Required____ Elective____ (Check one)

Instructor's Name_____

Class: Fr.____ Soph.____ Special____ (Check one)
Approximate Overall Grade Point Average:_____

DIRECTIONS TO STUDENTS: You are asked to rate your instructor on EACH item listed. To aid in your evaluation, note the three descriptions for each item. Select the description which describes the instructional situation as you see it. Then, further differentiate by circling the number which seems most precise in reflecting your judgement within the broad category beneath. The highest possible rating for an item is 10, and the lowest is 0, with nine gradations between.

Your instructor needs your honest appraisal. For this reason, we ask you to Please Not sign your name.

1.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Objectives are clearly defined.	Objectives are somewhat vague or indefinite.	Objectives are very vague no attention.
2.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Course is exceptionally well organized.	Course is satisfactorily organized.	Organization is very poor.
3.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Subject matter in agreement with course objectives.	Subject matter fairly well-suited to objectives.	Subject matter frequently unrelated to objectives.
4.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Makes good use of blackboard and other instructional aids.	Makes some use of blackboard and other instructional aids.	Makes little use of black-board & other instructional aids.
5.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Knowledge of subject is broad, accurate, up-to-date.	Knowledge of subject is somewhat limited and at times not up-to-date.	Knowledge of subject is seriously deficient and frequently inaccurate and out-of-date.

6.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Explanations are clear.	Explanations at times are not clear.	Explanations are frequently not clear.
7.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Stimulates high degree of interest among students.	Students seem only mildly interested.	Majority of students are inattentive most of the time.
8.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Students are inspired to do much sound and independent thinking; stimulated to do much independent work outside class.	Students are inspired to do some independent thinking, stimulated to do some independent work outside class.	Students do little thinking and only enough work outside to "get by."
9.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Instructor has very broad interests and culture; frequently relates course to other fields and to present day problems.	Instructor has fair breadth of interest and culture; occasionally relates subject to other fields and to present day problems.	Instructor is narrow in his interests and culture; seldom relates subject to other fields or to present day problems.
10.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Manner pleasing; free from annoying mannerisms.	Mannerisms are not seriously objectionable.	Constantly exhibits annoying mannerisms.
11.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Instructor is exceptionally friendly; always willing to help students when he has time.	Instructor is moderately friendly; usually willing to help students.	Instructor is aloof or sarcastic and preoccupied; unwilling to help students.
12.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Speaks clearly and distinctly.	Words sometimes indistinct and hard to hear	Words very indistinct; often impossible to hear.

13.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Grading is fair and impartial, based on several evidences and achievement.	Show partiality at times - grades based on a few evidences of achievement.	Frequently shows partiality; grades based on very limited evidences of achievement.
14.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Encourages differences of opinion; honest in admitting when he does not know.	Moderately tolerant of different viewpoints; usually willing to admit when he does not know.	Displeased by opposite viewpoint; dogmatic and argumentative even when clearly wrong.
15.	10 9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1 0
	Superior teacher.	Average teacher.	Very poor teacher.

WRITE OR PRINT YOUR COMMENTS ON: (Use additional paper if necessary.)

A. The course:

B. The instructor:

C. Text:

D. Tests & Assignments:

Form No. 15

FLORIDA TAXONOMY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR

Directions

The Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behavior provides a framework for observing and recording the cognitive behavior of the teacher and students in a classroom. Your role as an observer is to watch and listen for signs of the behavior described and to record the behavior as it occurs.

There are five (5) separate 6-minute observation and marking periods in each 30-minute visit to the classroom. These are indicated by the column headings I, II, III, IV, and V. During period I, as you observe the behavior of the teacher and students, go down the list of items and place a check (✓) in the T column (teacher behavior) and/or P column (pupil behavior) beside all items you saw occur. Leave blank all the items that did not occur or for which you cannot make a discrimination. A particular item is marked only once in a given column, no matter how many times that behavior occurs within the 6-minute observation period.

Repeat this process for the second 6-minute period, marking in Column II. Repeat again for the third, fourth, and fifth 6-minute periods, marking in Columns III, IV, and V. Please add the total number of (✓) recorded in Columns I through V for each teacher or pupil behavior and record in the columns headed TOT. There may be from 0 to 5 ✓'s for each item.

_____
Name of Teacher

_____
Date

_____
School

_____
Name of Observer

_____
Grade & Subject

FLORIDA TAXONOMY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR

TOT. T	TOT. P	T/P	T/P	T/P	T/P	T/P	
							1.10 KNOWLEDGE OF SPECIFICS
							1. Reads
							2. Spells
							3. Identifies something by name
							4. Defines meaning of term
							5. Gives a specific fact
							6. Tells about an event

1.20 KNOWLEDGE OF WAYS AND MEANS OF DEALING WITH SPECIFICS

						7. Recognizes smybol
						8. Cites rule
						9. Gives chronological sequence
						10. Gives steps of process, describes method
						11. Cites trend
						12. Names classification system or standard
						13. Names what fits given system or standard

1.30 KNOWLEDGE OF UNIVERSALS AND ABSTRACTIONS

						14. States generalized concept or idea
						15. States a principle, law, theory
						16. Tells about orgnztn or structure
						17. Recalls name of prin, law, theory

2.00 TRANSLATION

						18. Restates in own words or briefer terms.
						19. Gives cncrt exmpl of an abstract idea
						20. Verbalizes from a graphic rprsntatn
						21. Trans vrblztn into graphic form
						22. Trans fig stmnts to lit stmnts, or vice v
						23. Trans For lang to Eng, or vice versa

FLORIDA TAXONOMY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR

T	P	T/P	T/P	T/P	T/P	T/P	
							3.00 INTERPRETATION
							24. Gives reason (tells why)
							25. Shows similarities, diffrncs
							26. Summarizes or concludes frm obs of evdnce
							27. Shows cause and effect rltnshp
							28. Give analogy, simile, metaphor
							29. Performs a directed task or process
							4.00 APPLICATION
							30. Applies previous learning to new sitn
							31. Applies principle to new situation
							32. Apply abstrct knldg in a prctcl sitn
							33. Idntifs, selects, & carries out process
							5.00 ANALYSIS
							34. Distngshs fact from opinion
							35. Distngshs fact from hypothesis
							36. Distngshs cnclsn frm stmnts wch suppt it
							37. Points out unstated assumption
							38. Shows interaction of relation of elements
							39. Points out prticlrs to jstfy cnclsn
							40. Checks hypthss with given info
							41. Dstngshs rel frm irrelvnt stmnts
							42. Detects error in thinking
							43. Infers prpse, pt of view, thghts, feelings
							44. Recog bias or propaganda
							6.00 SYNTHESIS (CREATIVITY)
							45. Reorganizes ideas, materials, process
							46. Produces unique cmmnctn, divergent idea
							47. Produces a plan, prpsd set of oprtns
							48. Designs an apparatus
							49. Designs a structure
							50. Devises scheme for classifying info
							51. Formulates hypothesis, intelligent quess
							52. Mks dedctns frm abstrct smbls, propostns
							53. Draws inductive generalizatn frm specifcs
							7.00 EVALUATION
							54. Evaluates something from evdnce
							55. Evaluated something from criteria

Form No. 16

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME:_____ EVALUATED BY:

POSITION: _____ _____

DATE:_____ _____

General Instructions: Each numbered question contains several items. The general question is to be answered by checking only those items which are acceptable. Those items not checked indicate areas in which improvement could be made. No maximum or minimum number is suggested. This instrument, which will be improved annually, is designed to be of practical use to the individual being evaluated.

(1) IS PUNCTUAL:

___ Begins class on time
___ Ends class on time
___ Adheres to posted office hours
___ Arrives at meetings on time
___ Meets deadlines for paperwork

(2) IS RESPECTED BY ASSOCIATES:

___ Students
___ Department members
___ Division members
___ Other faculty, staff
___ Citizens of the community

(3) IS COURTEOUS WITH ASSOCIATES:

___ Students in class
___ Students outside class
___ Division members
___ Other faculty
___ Non-instructional staff

(4) REFRAINS FROM CRITICIZING:

___ Students before other students
___ Faculty before students, faculty
___ Students before citizens
___ Faculty before citizens
___ College before citizens

(5) TREATS STUDENTS FAIRLY:

___ Deals impartially w/males/females
___ Maintains control of class
___ Prevents class domination by few
___ Avoids favoritism
___ Explains class procedures, policies

(6) USES SUITABLE TESTING METHODS

___ States questions clearly
___ Suits test length to allotted time
___ Grades fairly and consistently
___ Covers assigned material with proper distribution of emphases
___ Gives reasonable number of tests
___ Returns, reviews test within reasonable time

(7) USES RESOURCES WISELY IN CLASS

___ Uses appropriate AV materials
___ Uses suitable library reading list if applicable
___ Uses appropriate duplicated material
___ Uses demonstration equipment if applicable

(8) COMMUNICATES IN CLASS WELL:

___ Speaks distinctly
___ Writes legibly
___ Speaks with sufficient volume
___ Expresses thoughts well
___ Avoids frequent annoying or distracting mannerisms

(9) STRUCTURES CLASSES IN SUITABLE MANNER:

___ Is prepared for class
___ Follows syllabus
___ Keeps pace with other sections of a multiple-section course
___ Organizes easy-to-follow lectures
___ Identifies important items clearly
___ Does not discuss irrelevant material
___ Defines assignments clearly

(10) PERFORMS WELL IN CLASS:

___ Knows his subject
___ Shows enthusiasm
___ Motivates students
___ Recognizes and overcomes difficulties in comprehension
___ Encourages participation
___ Encourages students to seek outside class assistance
___ Encourages independent thought
___ Has a sense of humor
___ Conducts lectures on suitable academic level

(11) STRIVES FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT

___ Uses the library frequently
___ Stays up w/discipline progress
___ Attends seminars, meetings, graduate courses at reasonable intervals
___ Member of appropriate learned society.
(A national organization devoted to a single discipline).
___ Is member of some professional group

(12) WORKS WELL WITH OTHERS:

___ Selecting equipment
___ Sharing Av materials
___ Planning schedules
___ Sharing student assistants and secretarial services
___ Selecting textbook
___ Teaching sections of multiple-section course, if applicable
___ Working on committees
___ Sharing experiences w/new faculty if applicable

(13) ACCEPTS DIVISION RESPONSIBILITIES:

___ Carries share of advisee load
___ Takes turn at teaching certain course
___ Fills in willingly for absent instructors
___ Performs assignments w/out supervision
___ Maintains orderly office
___ Leaves classroom in order
___ Recommends appropriate acquisitions for Library
___ Reasonably limits coffee breaks
___ Reasonably limits "bull" sessions
___ Reasonably limits personal phone calls and personal business on campus

(14) IS EMOTIONALLY MATURE, STABLE:

___ Avoids engaging in feuds and holding grudges
___ Responds reasonably to frustration and disappointment
___ Controls temper
___ Responds reasonably to constructive criticism
___ Recognizes, profits from mistakes

(15) HAS ADMIRABLE PERSONALITY TRAITS:

___ Respects those in other positions and disciplines
___ Avoids irritating mannerisms in an office suite
___ Shows tolerance and respect of others' personal beliefs
___ Avoids attempting to impose personal beliefs on students, faculty
___ Has positive and cheerful outlook
___ Can disagree agreeably and offer constructive criticism w/out offense
___ Has confidence in ability, judgment
___ Has a sense of humor

(16) PERFORMS WELL AS AN ADVISOR:

___ Devotes sufficient time to advising
___ Considers advising part of duties
___ Advises correctly
___ Keeps aware of advisee's progress

(17) EXHIBITS PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR:

___ Maintains well-groomed appearance
___ Employs suitable grammar, vocabulary
___ Has good physical health
___ Has knowledge, interests outside his discipline
___ Has initiative
___ Makes practical decisions
___ Approaches new ideas positively and objectively
___ Respects the chain of command
___ Avoids being a yes-man
___ Budgets time wisely
___ Interprets college to the community
___ Respects and implements department, division, and college policies
___ Maintains proper instructor-student relationship
___ Understands, appreciates function and philosophy of the public junior college
___ Offers reasonable support, attendance at college activities and programs
___ Avoids off-campus activities that infringe upon college duties or time, conflict with college policies, or reflect discredit on the college
___ Supports community service functions of the college

Form No. 17

STAFF EVALUATION FORM

NAME: _____ EVALUATED BY:
POSITION: _____ _____
DATE: _____ _____

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Each numbered question contains several items. The general question is to be answered by checking only those items which are acceptable. Those items not checked indicate areas in which improvement could be made. No maximum or minimum number is suggested. This instrument, which shall be improved annually, is designed to be of practical use to the individual being evaluated.

(1) IS PUNCTUAL:

___ Arrives at work on time
___ Keeps appointments on time
___ Adheres to posted office hours
___ Arrives at meetings on time
___ Meets deadlines for paperwork

(2) IS RESPECTED BY ASSOCIATES:

___ Students
___ Faculty
___ Administrative Staff
___ Non-professional personnel
___ Citizens of the community

(3) IS COURTEOUS WITH ASSOCIATES:

___ Students
___ Faculty
___ Administrative Staff
___ Non-instructional staff
___ Personnel under supervision

(4) REFRAINS FROM UNJUSTLY CRITICIZING:

___ Administrative Staff
___ Students
___ Faculty
___ The Junior College
___ The community

(5) TREATS OTHERS FAIRLY:

___ Deals impartially w/males/females
___ Avoids favoritism
___ Offers criticism privately
___ Gives credit where due

(6) IS EMOTIONALLY MATURE AND STABLE:

___ Avoids holding grudges
___ Responds well to disappointment
___ Controls temper
___ Reacts well to criticism
___ Profits from mistakes

(7) HAS GOOD WORKING HABITS:

___ Maintains orderly office
___ Reasonably limits coffee breaks
___ Reasonably limits "bull" sessions
___ Limits personal phone calls
___ Limits personal business on campus

(8) HAS ADMIRABLE DISPOSITION:

___ Is reasonably cheerful
___ Is proud of Junior College
___ Enjoys being "part of the team"
___ Is seldom dogmatic
___ Is enthusiastic in his work

(9) COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY:

___ Informs personnel of new developments
___ Informs staff of developments in his area
___ Knows how to listen
___ Is aware of student opinion on campus
___ Is aware of faculty opinion on campus

(10) WORKS WELL WITH OTHERS:

___ Selecting, using equipment
___ Utilizing secretarial assistance
___ Working on committees
___ Working on assignments

(11) STRIVES FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT

___ Uses library frequently
___ Keeps up w/discipline progress
___ Keeps up w/profession progress
___ Attends meetings, seminars
___ Takes graduate courses occasionally
___ Joins appropriate learned group
___ Joins appropriate professional group

(12) SERVES THE COMMUNITY:

___ Gives to some community project
___ Is member of some civic organization
___ Participates in some church activity
___ Is cautious in community controversy
___ Votes in local elections

(13) PERFORMS RESPONSIBILITIES WELL:

___ Knows college organization and policies
___ Solicits other opinions on a decision
___ Is capable of seeing different sides
___ Remains calm in crises
___ Does not use position for personal gain
___ Makes practical decisions
___ Has initiative
___ Accepts group policies, decisions
___ Can adjust as needed
___ Can face and solve problems
___ Works extra hours as needed
___ Attends college programs, activities
___ Performs without supervision
___ Refrains from "snap" judgments
___ Approaches ideas positively, objectively.

(14) PRACTICES LEADERSHIP TECHNIQUES

___ Recognizes rights, needs of others
___ Shows appreciation to others
___ Often encourages, praises others
___ Requests rather than orders
___ Admits mistakes voluntarily
___ Does not "talk down" to anyone
___ Has positive, cheerful outlook

(15) HAS GOOD PERSONALITY TRAITS:

___ Respects those in other positions
___ Avoids irritating mannerisms
___ Respects others' personal beliefs
___ Doesn't impose personal beliefs on others
___ Can disagree agreeably
___ Offers criticism without offending
___ Is confident in own ability, judgment
___ Has a sense of humor

(16) EXHIBITS PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

___ Maintains well-groomed appearance
___ Employs suitable grammar, vocabulary
___ Has good physical health
___ Possesses interests outside specialization
___ Respects the chain-of-command
___ Avoids being a "yes-man"
___ Avoids being a "no-man"
___ Budgets time wisely
___ Interprets college to the community
___ Respects and implements college policies
___ Maintains proper administrator-student relationship

(16) EXHIBITS PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (CONTINUED):

___ Understands and appreciates function and philosophy of public junior college
___ Avoids off-campus activities that infringe upon college duties or time, conflict with college policies, or reflect discredit on the college
___ Supports community service function of the college

FORM NO. 18

DATE _____

FACULTY MEMBER _____ DEPARTMENT _____

EVALUATOR _____ _____
(Name and Title) (Evaluator's Signature)

The faculty member's evaluative paragraph is based on the following areas:

1. Professional performance
2. Professional growth
3. Other contributions to the College

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In summary, the faculty member is:

1. Competent
2. Unsatisfactory

I have read and discussed all items on this evaluation with the person responsible for preparing the report, and I have been furnished a copy. I understand I may attach a response to this evaluation form within five (5) working days.

Received by:

Division Director _____

Dean _____ _____
(Faculty Member's Signature)

Vice President _____ _____
(Date)

FORM NO. 19

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instructor _____ Date _____

Person making the evaluation _____

This form is to be completed by the Dean or Department Head and discussed with the instructor.

	Not at all	To a limited extent	Adequately	Very Satisfac-torily
1. Does the instructor reflect in his teaching, in his out-of-class work with students, and in his work with other members of the faculty that he understands and accepts the philosophy and objectives of the college and is able to implement them in his work?				
2. Does the instructor appear to be able to communicate the subject matter effectively to the students?				
3. Is the instructor effective in furthering the work of the department?				
4. Does the instructor contribute positively to the morale of the students of the college by being cooperative, courteous, and helpful with students?				
5. Does the instructor contribute positively to the morale of the faculty of the department by being cooperative, courteous, and helpful with his co-workers?				
6. Does the instructor appear to be willing to grow and change in an effort to improve himself as an instructor?				
7. Does the instructor appear to actively seek ways of improving his instructional techniques?				
8. Does the instructor appear to support the policies and regulations of the college?				

Signature of person making evaluation _____

Signature of person evaluated _____

Form No. 20

ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT-FACULTY EVALUATION

In an effort to expedite and improve the administration of the teacher-evaluation in all day-time classes and to reduce class interruption to a minimum, the Student Government Association asks that the evaluation be conducted in the following manner:

1. Each instructor will pick up all cards, making pencils and instructions for his classes as soon as possible from the Student Activities Office.

2. Evaluation is to be done this week in each day-time class having at least two students present. The time is to be selected by the instructor.

3. If there is an SGA member in his class this student will conduct the evaluation. If there is no representative the instructor will select a student to conduct it.

4. The instructor leaves the room, the student then gives a marking pencil and instruction sheet to each student.

5. The student reads the instruction sheet ALOUD, stressing the fact that FIVE is the High mark and ONE is the Low. He should also stress that students may write comments on the cards. IBM cards are then distributed and all students (including the student conducting the evaluation) mark their cards.

6. The student will collect the cards, pencils and instructions. Marked cards must equal the number of students present. The student administrator will write the number of marked cards on the outside of the envelope. He will verify that the total of the marked and unmarked cards equals the number already marked on the envelope and indicate this by signing his name on the envelope. After sealing, the envelope is to be immediately returned by the student administrator to the Student Activities Office.

7. When all of his classes have completed their evaluations the pencils and instruction sheets should be returned to the Student Activities Office.

Please note that these instructions do not apply to night classes. Evaluation procedures for these classes have already been given to the instructors concerned.

STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTOR

Each student is expected to rate his instructor in each of the following categories:

A. **Positive Personal Traits**
(Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, etc.)

B. Knowledge
(Command of Subject)

C. Class Presentation
(Planning, Organization, Skill)

D. Accuracy of this instructor's evaluation of your work
(Understanding, Accurate, Fair)

SCALE:

SUPERIOR . . . . . 5 points
EXCELLENT . . . . . 4 points
GOOD . . . . . 3 points
FAIR . . . . . 2 points
POOR . . . . . 1 point

Using a mark sense pencil, you are to black out the appropriate bubble for each category rating. All written comments are to be written in the space provided for on the card. For any additional space needed for comments, use the back of the card.

AG201	NA1	2	68						
Course Code	Section	Term	Year	Instructor Rating			895	COMMENTS	

·A·	·B·	·C·	·D·	·E·	·F·	·G·	·H·	·I·	·J·
(· 1·)	(·1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(· 1 ·)	(·1 ·)	(·1 ·)
(· 2·)	(·2 ·)	(· 2 ·)	(·2 ·)	(· 2 ·)	(·2 ·)	(· 2 ·)	(· 2 ·)	(·2 ·)	(·2 ·)
(· 3·)	(·3 ·)	(· 3 ·)	(·3 ·)	(·3 ·)	(·3 ·)	(· 3 ·)	(· 3 ·)	(·3 ·)	(·3 ·)
(· 4·)	(·4 ·)	(· 4 ·)	(·4 ·)	(· 4 ·)	(· 4 ·)	(· 4 ·)	(· 4 ·)	(·4 ·)	(·4 ·)
(· 5·)	(·5 ·)	(· 5 ·)	(·5 ·)	(· 5 ·)	(· 5 ·)	(· 5 ·)	(· 5 ·)	(·5 ·)	(·5 ·)

USE MARK SENSE PENCIL
ONLY

Form No. 21

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS BY DIVISION CHAIRMAN

Instructor _____ Date _____

Points Earned:		Points Possible:
A.	Academic Proficiency:	
___	1. Knowledge adequate for course assignments	___
___	2. Preparation and effectiveness of presentation	___
___	3. Rapport with students	___
___	4. Student evaluation of teacher	___
B.	Cooperation exhibited by:	
___	1. Attitude toward course assignments of the chairman	___
___	2. Willingness to assist students outside class	___
___	3. Willingness to serve the college beyond the classroom, and willingness to accept non-instructional tasks within the Division	___
___	4. Relations with other faculty members	___
C.	Initiative In:	
___	1. Suggesting curriculm improvements	___
___	2. Contributing constructive ideas, or criticisms concerning the instructional program and general operation of the Division	___
___	3. Acquiring additional professional training, seeking professional improvement, and involvement with professional organizations	___
D.	Dependability and efficiency in:	
___	1. Following college policies in meeting classes as scheduled	___
___	2. Performing tasks within the Division	___
___	3. Performing tasks assigned by the College	___
___	TOTAL	TOTAL ___

____ Has continuing contract

____ Recommended for annual contract PERCENT _____

____ Recommended for continuing contract

SIGNED _____

Form No. 22

ANNUAL REPORT ON PERFORMANCE

To be completed annually for each certified person by the Dean of Instruction, the President or his representative.

Item	No information	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments when applicable
Summary of interim reports				
1. Professional growth				
2. Knowledge of current scholarship in the field				
3. Grading practices				
4. Emotional stability				
5. Physical ability to perform duties				
6. Tact and consideration				
7. Neatness and appropriateness of dress				
8. Cooperation with colleagues				
9. Cooperation with Administration				
10. Service on committees				
11. Cooperation in student activities				
12. Promptness and accuracy of reports				
13. Vision and Creativity				
14. Community activities related to welfare of the college				
15. Participation in professional organizations				
16. Interest in and willingness to confer with students				

Summary paragraph:

Recommend:

Signed:_____ Title: _____

Date: _____

Form No. 23

CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

INSTRUCTOR _____
COLLEGE _____
COURSE NAME _____

1. Type of Class _____ 2. Size of Class _____
3. Topic Covered _____ 4. Method of Presentation _____

DATE _____
LENGTH OF VISIT _____

PHILOSOPHY OF CLASSROOM VISITATION:

From the inception of the Junior College, the Board of Trustees and staff have been committed to a quality program featuring at all times excellence in instruction. The College is a student-centered institution in which the various curricula are developed to take care of the heterogeneous student body. Evaluation of instruction then becomes a necessity. One of several methods is the classroom visitation. The following procedure will be utilized during the 1968-69 academic year and revised by the staff for use during subsequent years.

PROCEDURE:

Following each classroom visit, the visitor shall write an appraisal of the overall classroom performance, commenting specifically on at least three points in each general category below, noting particularly those areas of apparent excellence or weakness, and recommending steps for improvement. The instructor should add any comment he desires, sign his name and show the date.

A. Presentation:

1. Knowledge - The instructor should be especially well prepared for the specific topics to be covered.

_____
_____
_____

2. Organization - The topics should be presented in a logical and meaningful organization.

_____
_____
_____

3. Enthusiasm - The presentation should be made with enthusiasm for the subject, the specific course, and the teaching-learning process.

_____
_____
_____

4. Level - The level of presentation should be consistent with the level of the course and the development of the students.

5. AV Materials - The presentation should utilize appropriate audio and/or visual aids in a meaningful and effective way.

6. Delivery - The presentation should be delivered in a clear voice with sufficient variation in tone and volume, while minimizing any distracting mannerisms.

B. Atmosphere:

1. Direction - There should be a clear and steady direction to the class session; digression should be minimized and should result from student interest.

2. Attention - The students should be attentive and eager to learn.

3. Instructor's Questions - The instructor should pose stimulating and non-threatening questions for the students to consider.

4. Students' Response - The students should respond freely but seriously to an instructor's question.

5. Students' Questions - The students should feel free and be given the opportunity to ask related questions.

_____

_____

_____

6. Instructor's Response - The instructor should respond in a helpful and non-threatening manner to all relevant questions and should reinforce acceptable answers while correcting error without ridicule or threat.

_____

_____

_____

Instructor's Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Signature of Instructor Date

_____ _____

Signature of Evaluator Date

Form No. 24

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Name: _____ Date: _____

Department: _____ Years at: _____ : _____

The purpose of this evaluation is to try to distinguish between skilled performance and lesser competency. Both the instructor and evaluator must assume responsibility in judging the effectiveness of the instructor and in the continuing effort to improve instruction.

It should be recognized that the true value of the evaluation rests on the sound judgment of the rater and not on the validity or reliability of the items and descriptive phrases as sound measures of instructor effectiveness.

We must also accept the fact that on every campus there is an "average" or "median" instructor and that he is an altogether acceptable person. It is likely that most of us are such, and that there is little measurable difference from top to bottom.

With the above understanding as a basis for making decisions it can be expected that a majority of checkmarks will fall in the middle column for every teacher. A checkmark in the adjacent columns should mean that the teacher is noticeably above or below average in the indicated quality.

A checkmark in either the left or right column must invariably carry a note of explanation. The left checkmark implies near perfection in the quality indicated.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This form is to be completed in conference, signed by both parties, and forwarded to the Dean for his signature and review.

THIS IS CONFIDENTIAL

A. PERSONAL QUALITIES RELATIVE TO CAMPUS EFFECTIVENESS

1. APPEARANCE

__/__/ Always extremely well groomed and presents outstanding personal appearance.	__/__/ Neat personal appearance and grooming.	__/__/ Takes normal care of appearance.	__/__/ Occasionally inclined to neglect appearance.	__/__/ Lacks concern about personal grooming and appearance.

2. CAMPUS DEMEANOR

__/__/ Bearing and behavior are outstanding.	__/__/ Especially good behavior and bearing. Creates a very favorable impression.	__/__/ Bearing and behavior create a good impression.	__/__/ Careless bearing and behavior detract from his effectiveness.	__/__/ Bearing or behavior interfere seriously with his effectiveness.

3. OFF CAMPUS DEMEANOR

__/__/ Bearing and behavior are outstanding.	__/__/ Especially good behavior and bearing. Creates a very favorable impression.	__/__/ Bearing and behavior create a good impression.	__/__/ Careless bearing and behavior detract from his effectiveness.	__/__/ Bearing or behavior interfere seriously with his effectiveness.

4. OFF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

__/__/ Honor to _____.	__/__/ Good public relations.	__/__/ Average	__/__/ Interferes with ____. responsibilities.	__/__/ Detrimental to _____.

5. HUMAN RELATIONS

__ / / Outstanding skills in human relations increases his effectiveness.	__ / / His above average skills in human relations are an asset.	__ / / Gets along with people adequately. Has average skill at maintaining good human relations.	__ / / He has difficulty in getting along with his associates.	__ / / Does not get along well with people; definitely hinders his effectiveness.

6. LEADERSHIP

__ / / Leadership qualities reflect potential for highest level.	__ / / Exceptional skill in directing others to great effort.	__ / / Consistently a good leader. Commands respect of his subordinates.	__ / / Normally develops fairly adequate control and teamwork.	__ / / Often weak in command situations. At times unable to exert control.

7. JUDGMENT

__ / / Has a knack for arriving at the right decision even on highly complex matters.	__ / / An exceptionally sound, logical thinker in situations which occur on his job.	__ / / Displays good judgment, resulting from sound evaluation. He is effective.	__ / / His judgment is usually sound and reasonable, with occasional errors.	__ / / Decisions and recommendations are sometimes unsound or ineffective.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. PREPARATION FOR CLASS

__ / / Prepared carefully for each class.	__ / / Generally well prepared.	__ / / Average preparation.	__ / / Frequently below par.	__ / / Evidence of inadequate preparation.

2. STUDENT REACTIONS TO TEACHER				
☐ Average reactions good.	☐	☐ No significant reaction.	☐	☐ Average reaction not good.
3. ATTENDANCE				
☐ Prompt, always present.	☐ Seldom late or absent.	☐ Occasionally late, absent when necessary.	☐ Frequently late or absent.	☐ Attendance unsatisfactory.
4. TESTING PROGRAM				
☐ Constructs and uses tests effectively.	☐ Testing program above average.	☐ Average testing program.	☐ Weak testing program.	☐ Inadequate testing program.
5. GRADING PRACTICES				
☐ Method clearly defined and properly based.	☐ Sound grading practice.	☐ Average practice - room for improvement.	☐ Weak - inadequate.	☐ Poor - unfair to students.
6. USE OF LIBRARY IN ASSIGNMENTS				
☐ Excellent	☐ Very good	☐ Average	☐ Seldom	☐ Never
7. SELF IMPROVEMENT				
☐ Excellent effort.	☐ Above average effort.	☐ Average effort keeps current.	☐ Needs attention	☐ Apparently indifferent.
8. EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING				
☐ Evidence indicates excellence.	☐ Evidence indicates superior	☐ Evidence indicates average.	☐ Evidence indicates weakness.	☐ Evidence indicates inadequacy
9. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THIS INDIVIDUAL DISPLAY THAT "UNIQUE TALENT" WHICH RAISES HIS PERFORMANCE ABOVE THE MERE "CRAFT" LEVEL OF TEACHING?				
☐ Master teacher.	☐ Above average	☐ A good teacher	☐ Improving	☐ Inexperienced

COMMENTS: (Add information relative to credits earned, seminars, and other items relative to this section.)

C. EFFECTIVENESS AS A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY GROUP

1. PARTICIPATION IN GENERAL FACULTY DUTIES

☐ Serves as sponsor, chaperone or on committees when requested.	☐ Likes to do his share.	☐ Average participation.	☐ Usually decides not to serve	☐ Refuses to serve

2. COOPERATION WITH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

☐ Extremely cooperative.	☐ Above average in cooperation.	☐ Average in cooperation.	☐ Prefers to act independently.	☐ Refuses to cooperate

3. INITIATIVE

☐ Outstanding in initiative.	☐ Above average in initiative.	☐ Average	☐ Needs some direction.	☐ Needs too much help.

4. RELATIONS WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY

☐ Provides leadership.	☐ Effective as a group member.	☐ Average, pleasant.	☐ Antagonistic argumentative.	☐ Somewhat unpleasant or resented

COMMENTS: (Add items relative to activities and membership in local and state education groups. Add honors and credits for record.)

D. EDUCATIONAL PERCEPTIVENESS

Has an outstanding grasp of his own functional role at _____, the various objectives of ___, and all levels of education in our society.	Has an outstanding insight into some of the following but is average in others; (1) His own functional role at ___ (2) The objectives and programs of _____ (3) Other levels of education.	Seems to have an average understanding of his own functional role in perspective to the overall objectives of ___, and of the other levels of education in our society.	Displays some lack of insight either about his own functional role, the objectives of _____, or other levels of education which keeps him from being a totally effective member of the faculty.	Displays such an obvious narrowness or lack of understanding about his his own role at ___, the overall objectives of _____, or other levels of education that he is a detriment to the college.	

This form has been checked in conference between the department chairman and faculty member whose signatures follow. If for any reason the faculty member wishes to make a protest, he should do so at the time of the checking. If he wishes to review the evaluation with the Dean, he should check below.

YES	NO

Review requested.

Signed,

_____
Member of the Faculty

_____
Dean of the College

_____
Department Chairman

Form No. 25

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please mark the column of the following opinionnaire according to the answer nearest your opinion of each characteristic listed for your instructor.

Yes	Partially or Sometimes	No	IN YOUR OPINION:
___	___	___	1. The instructor appears confident, and is well-poised.
___	___	___	2. His voice is well modulated, clearly understood and pleasing.
___	___	___	3. The instructor possesses a very good sense of humor.
___	___	___	4. The instructor starts his classes on time.
___	___	___	5. The instructor maintains good discipline in class and the class deportment is good.
___	___	___	6. Textbook and supplemental assignments are adequate.
___	___	___	7. Lectures and class discussions are consistent with material being studied and appear pertinent.
___	___	___	8. Material is presented in a clear, intelligent and interesting manner.
___	___	___	9. Assignments are clear and understandable.
___	___	___	10. Does the instructor utilize class time to fullest advantage?
___	___	___	11. The instructor provides adequate time for classroom discussions and questions.
___	___	___	12. The questions are answered effectively and to the point.
___	___	___	13. Does the instructor willingly give individual help when it is asked of him?
___	___	___	14. The instructor has the course well organized, is well prepared.
___	___	___	15. Do you feel free to go to this instructor with problems concerning subject matter?
___	___	___	16. The instructor maintains a high standard of work done by students.
___	___	___	17. The instructor adequately enforces his instruction by using illustrations, models and other visual aids.
___	___	___	18. The instructor goes over graded projects with the student enabling him to understand corrections.
___	___	___	19. The instructor is prompt in grading student projects and returning them to the student.
___	___	___	20. The examinations and quizzes are given frequently enough for the instructor to be able to make a fair evaluation of the students.
___	___	___	21. The instructor adequately explains his grading system and it should be understood by the students.
___	___	___	22. This instructor's class is free of cheating and dishonesty.
___	___	___	23. Do you consider the quality of this course to be equal to that of other courses taken in this and/or other institutions?

CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

_____ _____ Term _____

Instructor Evaluated Date

_____ _____

Department Course

Type		Visit Number:			
A. C.	-	1	2	3	4
C. C.	-	1			
C. C. + 10	-	1			

Methods Used:

Item	Rating S	N	U	Remarks
1. Objectives of the session were given, were understood, & reached.				
2. Evidence of preparation.				
3. Grasp of subject matter.				
4. Presentation (effective methods, clear explanations, use of time, staying on subject, etc.				
5. Mannerisms (use of voice, command of language, few distracting actions, etc.).				
6. Student participation and/or response (involvement indicated.)				
7. General effectiveness of this session.				

What especially strong points were noted?

_____

What especially weak points were noted?

_____

_____
Evaluator's Signature

S - Satisfactory to outstanding
N - Needs improvement
U - Unsatisfactory

Form No. 26

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

1. Evaluation is the conscious and discriminating appraisal of the effectiveness of the instructor. Since there is no typically superior instructor, no valid objective criteria, other than academic degree and length of service, have been developed. Therefore, it should be realized that the value of such an appraisal is conditioned by the wisdom and insight of the evaluators. Because of this fact, this evaluation is conducted cooperatively by the Department Head and the Dean of Instruction in order that the insight of each may be checked against the other.

2. The faculty is requested to continuously evaluate the current instrument and procedure and recommend additional methods of arriving at fair evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

3. It is recommended that the current instrument be used in the following manner:

   a. Each Department Head is to evaluate each member of his department.

   b. The Department Head shall discuss with the instructor those areas in which the instructor needs improvement, suggesting how the instructor might improve.

   c. The evaluation forms are then to be forwarded to the Dean of Instruction.

   d. If the faculty member receives an overall satisfactory evaluation, the form is to be destroyed by the Dean of Instruction. If the faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory evaluation, the Department Head is to notify the instructor and arrange a meeting with the Dean of Instruction, at which time the instructor will be allowed to present his position in the presence of the Department Head and Dean. At the discretion of the Dean, the form is either retained or destroyed.

EVALUATION FORM FOR CERTIFIED PERSONNEL

NAME _____

DEPARTMENT HEAD _____

DEAN OF INSTRUCTION _____

CRITERIA	Satisfactory	Needs Improving	Unsatisfactory	Unable to Evaluate	
1. Professional Knowledge Consider his knowledge of his subject field; his potential for continuous growth; his competency in the use of basic skills.					
2. Planning for Instruction Consider the evidence of consistent, thorough, and creative planning; his ability to execute plans exceptionally well; his plan for testing and the utilization of test results as a learning experience; his ability to prepare test items which measure students' understanding of course objectives.					
3. Effectiveness of Communication of Subject Matter Consider his ability to present ideas and concepts in a logical manner; his ability to present ideas and concepts in more than one way.					
4. Resourcefulness in Varying Teaching Methods Consider his efforts to begin class promptly and to use all the class time wisely; his ability to introduce a wide variety of teaching methods and his skill in relating them to previous learning; his manner of presentation; his manner in responding to questions; his ability to make students think for themselves; his attitude toward the adaptation of his presentation of new innovations.					
5. Use of Facilities for Teaching - Printed and Audio-Visual Materials Consider his ability to discriminate in the selection of instructional materials that are relevant to the course; his ability to use materials to enrich his teaching and to stimulate thought; his attitude toward the use of new types of audio-visual material in his presentation.					

CRITERIA	Satisfactory	Needs Improving	Unsatisfactory	Unable to Evaluate	
6. Professional Enthusiasm Consider his interest in activities - self-study, College courses - workshops - for growth in his discipline; his alertness to new developments in his teaching field.					
7. Control of Classes Consider his ability to control his class in event of student misbehavior and correct it in a firm and reasonable manner.					
8. Individual Attention to Student Problems Consider his interest and concern for the students enrolled in his class; his ability to work with students who have problems grasping the contents of the course.					
9. Stimulation of Creative Thinking Does he pose penetrating questions beyond the "communication of subject matter?" Does he design projects which lead not only to synthesis of presented material, but require students to extrapolate beyond it?					
10. Personal Qualities					
a. Professional attitude Consider his membership in organizations which enhance the teaching profession; his adherence to professional ethics.					
b. Personality Consider his vigor for life and work; his ability to speak clearly and distinctly; the way he impresses others in his appearance; his gestures and posture and their relation to his activities; his ability to maintain poise and self-control under criticism; his contact with students is on a friendly, courteous and professional basis.					
c. Cooperation Consider his efforts to assist others at the College; his willingness to sacrifice his own interests to the best interest of the College.					

CRITERIA	Satisfactory	Needs Improving	Unsatisfactory	Unable to Evaluate	
d. Responsibility Consider his participation in developing rules and regulations to implement policies to govern the College; his willingness to assume leadership; his schedule of office hours and his adherence to the schedule; his prompt, efficient, and accurate reporting of grades and other requests for information; his punctuality in meeting classes and other meetings.					

Form #27

NAME OF INSTRUCTOR _____ DATE _____

CLASS OBSERVED _____

LENGTH OF OBSERVATION _____

*COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DATE OF CONFERENCE WHEN THIS OBSERVATION WAS DISCUSSED WITH INSTRUCTOR

_____

_____
CHAIRMAN

_____
DEPARTMENT

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS - (AFTER CONFERENCE WITH INSTRUCTOR)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

* If additional space is needed, please use back of this page.

FORM # 28 - EVALUATION OF TEACHING FACULTY

School Year 19 ____ - 19 ____

_____
Instructor

_____
Evaluator

_____
Department

_____
Position

_____
Certificate Number

_____
Social Security Number

Rating Scale:
1. Superior
2. Excellent
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

Circle the appropriate number in the left column. While a rating of 4 or 5 must be explained in writing, comments should be made on each category.

1. Demonstrates professional growth. (Takes courses; attends institutes; works on committees -- either local, state, or national; contributes professionally in other ways; etc.)

1
2 Comments: _____
3
4 _____
5

2. Teaching effectiveness.

1
2 Comments: _____
3
4 _____
5

a. Is the instructor free of handicaps which would hamper his teaching effectiveness? (Physical health, Emotional stability, Personal appearance, Ethics) Yes ____ No ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

b. Is the broad spectrum of informal teacher and student comment about this instructor generally favorable? Yes ____ No ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

3. Adheres to time schedules for classes and consultations.
   1
   2 Comments: _____
   3
   4 _____
   5

4. Adheres to deadlines for turning in grades and other requested information.
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

5. Participates in community activities and extra-curricular activities which enhance the image of the college.

   Comments: _____

   _____

6. Generally cooperative with
   a. Faculty Members. Yes ____ No____ Comments: _____

   _____

   b. Departmental Chairman Yes ____ No ____ Comments: _____

   _____

   c. Administration. Yes ____ No ____ Comments: _____

   _____

7. Are there additional comments on the back? Yes ____ No ____

A conference has been held with my department chairman.

_____
Instructor

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Form No. 29

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTOR RATING FORM

Name of Course

Instructor's Name

College IBM Number

Department

1.	Knowledge of Subject	1 2 expert -- outstanding	3 4 well informed--adequate	5 6 Inadequate--makes many gross errors
2.	Use of Knowledge	1 2 enriches the subject material--makes course relevant to other fields	3 4 adequate use of instructional materials--teaches the essentials	5 6 inferior--leaves student unprepared for advanced work
3.	Use of Class Time	1 2 sticks to subject	3 4 occasionally gets side tracked or digresses	5 6 seldom deals with subject--wastes time constantly
4.	Organization of Course	1 2 clearly planned well in advance	3 4 adequately prepared	5 6 disorganized and chaotic
5.	Objectives of the Course	1 2 purpose clearly defined early in the course	3 4 changing and gradually developing goals	5 6 no clear goals--unpredictable demands made
6.	Teaching Talent	1 2 stimulating and interesting	3 4 routine and factual	5 6 dull and lifeless

7.	Communication Skill	1 2 can communicate difficult subject matter	3 4 adequate presentation of standard material	5 6 has trouble getting the obvious across
8.	Control of Class	1 2 clearly directs and leads the class	3 4 occasionally disturbed by the unexpected	5 6 often loses control of the class
9.	Attitude toward Questions	1 2 considerate and gives clear answers	3 4 abrupt and sometimes confusing answers	5 6 hostile: intolerant of interruptions and gives poor answers
10.	Attitude toward Discussion	1 2 encourages open differences in opinion	3 4 tolerates, but does not welcome differences	5 6 intolerant and biased
11.	Attitude toward students	1 2 respects them as individuals	3 4 often treats them as a group	5 6 is totally indifferent
12.	Grading	1 2 very fair	3 4 fair--sometimes misjudges slightly	5 6 unfair and arbitrary
13.	Standards Required by Instructor	1 2 related to department requirements of excellence	3 4 doesn't "downgrade" either college or student	5 6 unrealistic: too high or too low to be meaningful
14.	Sense of Humor	1 2 would get good T. V. ratings	3 4 keen and pleasing sense of humor	5 6 dull and hard to endure

15.	Availability Outside of Class	1 2 keeps office hours--generous with time--always approachable	3 4 sometimes fails to meet appointments--a little abrupt	5 6 never in office or is hostile to meeting with students
16.	Quality of Course	1 2 better than what I had expected	3 4 on par with what I had expected	5 6 not of college calibre
17.	Testing of Material	1 2 an accurate measure of both significance and amount of material covered	3 4 some questions are unfair or poorly phrased	5 6 totally unrelated to material covered
18.	Punctuality	1 2 prompt and dependable	3 4 sometimes late	5 6 consistently misses class--always late
19.	Treatment of Tests and Assigned Work	1 2 corrected, interpreted, and returned promptly	3 4 slow to return such material--few suggestions for improvement offered	5 6 tests and work are seldom if ever, returned

Form No. 30

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The Administrative Council has adopted the accompanying faculty evaluation form to be used for the 1968-69 academic year. Attention is called to the evaluative process as a means of improving performance, and the approach to this process should be from a positive point of view. The evaluation is a culmination of a continuous process of observations and discussions which characterize the supervisor's role throughout the school year. One of the main comments from the faculty re the evaluation form involved the inability of the supervisor to evaluate effectively without extensive classroom visitation. It should be noted that the evaluation is based on a composite of sources, which could include:

1. Opinion of peers
2. Student evaluation
3. Classroom observation
4. Conferences with evaluatee

SUPERVISORS OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY SHOULD USE THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES:

1. Fill out the entire evaluation form in duplicate.
2. Have a conference with the evaluatee to discuss the evaluation.
3. Evaluator and evaluatee sign the forms.
4. If the evaluatee does not agree with the evaluation, he or she should so state on the form.
5. Send the completed forms to your dean of instruction by (date).

SUPERVISORS OF NONINSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY SHOULD USE THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES:

1. Fill out evaluation form in duplicate. Because Section 1 would not necessarily apply to non-teaching faculty members, it is suggested that that portion of Section 1 be deleted where it is not applicable. (Those items not applicable should be noted prior to filling in the form.)
2. Have a conference with the evaluatee to discuss the evaluation.
3. Evaluator and evaluatee sign the forms.
4. If the evaluatee does not agree with the evaluation, he or she should so state on the form.
5. Send the completed forms to your immediate supervisor by (date).

Thank you.

Form No. 30 - Page 2

Name _____ Date _____

Department or Area _____

EVALUATION FORM

CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

I.

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
   - Exceptionally well informed .... ____
   - Adequately informed ..... ____
   - Not well informed ..... ____

2. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
   - Systematic and thorough ..... ____
   - Adequate ..... ____
   - Inadequate..... ____

3. PRESENTATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
   - Well adapted to subject & students . ____
   - Fairly well adapted ..... ____
   - Poorly adapted ..... ____

4. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT
   - Enthusiastic ..... ____
   - Usually interested ..... ____
   - Seldom interested ..... ____

5. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN
   - Explanations clear and to the point ____
   - Explanations usually adequate ... ____
   - Explanations usually inadequate.. ____

6. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS
   - Excellent ..... ____
   - Adequate ..... ____
   - Inadequate..... ____

7. STIMULATION OF INDEPENDEN THINKING
   - Considerable stimulation ____
   - Some stimulation ..... ____
   - Discourages independent thinking ..... ____

8. SPEAKING ABILITY
   - Excellent ..... ____
   - Adequate ..... ____
   - Poor ..... ____

9. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS
   - Interested and willing to help ..... ____
   - Moderately helpful .... ____
   - Cold, unconcerned .... ____

II. AREAS OF STRENGTHS

III. AREAS OF NEEDED IMPROVEMENT

IV. COMMENTS

I certify that I have had an opportunity to review this evaluation.

(Signature of Evaluatee)	(Signature of Evaluator)
(Position or title at time of evaluation)	Date
Date	(President)
Fill out in duplicate and return to office of your supervisor	One copy to office of personnel records One copy for supervisor

Form #31

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Faculty Qualifications:	Above Average	Average	Below Average
1. Teacher is familiar with subject			
2. Goals for the course are clearly spelled out.			
3. Major test dates are planned.			
4. Daily assignments (or weekly) are clearly made.			
5. Assignments are reasonable in amount and difficulty.			
6. Directions are clearly spelled out for formal work (such as term papers, projects, reports, performances, etc.)			
7. The topics covered support the stated goals of the course.			
8. The course is challenging.			
9. Communicates his ideas well			
10. Receives communications well: can understand student's question.			
11. Shows enthusiasm for subject.			
12. Tries to make subject interesting to students.			
13. Relates subject to familiar experiences in everyday life.			
14. Uses audio-visual aids such as films, overhead projectors, tape recorders, programmed material.			
15. Uses other visual aids and examples, black board illustrations, charts, models, demonstrations.			
16. Encourages questions.			
17. Respects the opinion of students in discussions.			
18. Encourages original thinking.			
19. Encourages use of the library.			
20. Uses community resources (such as guest speakers, field trips, etc.)			

Faculty Qualifications:		Above Average	Average	Below Average
21.	Encourages students to come in for extra help and conferences.			
22.	Tests cover the material assigned and material covered in class.			
23.	The tests themselves are made so that they help you learn.			
24.	Tests or results are returned.			
25.	Tests results are discussed in class to improve understanding.			
26.	Teacher uses more than one kind of evaluation (such as conferences oral reports or exams, written reports, term papers, etc.)			
27.	You are informed of your grades on reports, projects.			
28.	Projects, reports, etc., are discussed in class to improve understanding.			
29.	I feel he really cares about me.			
30.	Of all the teachers you have ever had, please rate this teacher on overall performance as a teacher.			

Form No. 32

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

Current Contract Status: /_/ Annual (____ Years employed at _____)

/_/ Continuing

_____ _____ _____

Instructor Division School Year

	Sat.	Unsat. *	(1st yr. Only) Uncertain
1. Knowledge of subject matter. (Has thorough and current knowledge of subject matter to effectively meet the course requirements.)	____	____	____
2. Presentation of subject matter. (Uses procedures designed to achieve objectives of particular course and makes use of suitable material and equipment.)	____	____	____
3. Attitude toward students. (Recognizes problems inherent to the junior college students; demonstrates willingness to assist students with their problems)	____	____	____
4. Works with others to improve the division. (Participates in the evaluation, revision, and development of the curriculum and performs assigned division duties.)	____	____	____

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PERFORMANCE:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: *(If unsatisfactory, explain here)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend this instructor for annual contract. Yes ____ No ____

I recommend this instructor for continuing contract. Yes ____ No ____

_____ _____

Evaluator's signature Date

INSTRUCTOR'S COMMENTS:

_____ (Signature)

Form No. 33

FACULTY EVALUATION

_____
Instructor

The degree of success attained by any teacher depends largely upon the extent to which he has acquired and to which he utilizes certain qualities, competencies, and traits. Of primary importance are those characteristics identified below which are directly related to professional fitness.

Will you please indicate to the best of your ability your rating of the faculty member identified on the characteristics described below by circling a letter on the scale to the right (A - Excellent, B - Above Average, C - Average, D - Below Average).

Please identify the faculty member being rated on this form by placing his/her name in the top left corner of this page.

A Effectiveness with Students

1. Teaching Ability: A B C D

   Success in securing optimum progress on the part of students; resourcefullness--the ability to vary classroom procedure in order to stimulate the interest and intellectual curiosity of his students; the ability to inspire students to think for themselves; and a genuine and contagious interest in the subjects which he teaches.

2. Advising Ability: A B C D

   An appreciation and respect for young people; a patient and tactful manner of meeting them on common ground; an appreciation of their viewpoint and a sympathetic understanding of their problems; a resourceful and growing fund of knowledge and experience valuable for advising and guidance; an ability to secure interested effort and demonstrate progress on the part of the students toward desired and worthy goals.

3. Character and Personality: A B C D

   Integrity in thought, word, and action; courage; tact; enthusiasm; sense of humor; attractiveness in appearance and manner; a high sense of professional responsibility.

B Scholarship A B C D

A depth of scholarship sufficient for mastery in his own field; a breadth sufficient for the integration of his own with related fields; a height sufficient for an appreciation of the philosophical implications of the whole; the demonstrated ability to contribute to knowledge in his own field; a continued interest and activity in research; and facility in the written and spoken word.

C Capacity A B C D

An elasticity, an eagerness, and a balance of mind that promote a continuing and sane enrichment of his knowledge and of all his powers--essentially a result of scholarship of a live and progressive character, manifested by continued study, scholarly interests, creative work, professional participation, and intelligent performance in educational activities.

D General Educational Activity A B C D

A willingness to assume responsibility for participating in college activities and to work constructively within them; an acceptance and fulfillment of educational responsibilities outside the classroom; identification with community movements of a genuinely educational character; service in professional organizations of local, statewide, or national scope.

E Loyalty to College and Profession A B C D

This includes support in word and deed of the Board of Trustees, Administration and Colleagues. Work for other remuneration while employed by the College is deemed worthy only when it enhances the prestige of the College and when it does not interfere with the instructor's work at the College. Occasional honoraria for speaking engagements or occasional fees for consultations are considered satisfactory.

I have, in all sincerity, attempted to evaluate this faculty member in terms of the characteristics identified as honestly as possible and to the best of my ability.

Signed: _____

02-19-70

Form No. 34

STUDENT RATING SHEET FOR TEACHERS

To the Student:

We are requesting that you carefully read each statement listed below and that you rate or evaluate your teacher by means of marking the attached answer sheet. You should be as objective as possible so that this report will be fair and honest. Read each item carefully and understand it before attempting an evaluation of the teacher in terms of the statement. The attached answer sheet provides spaces for answering by means of marking 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 for each of the 20 items shown below. Indicate your estimate of the teacher's relative strength in terms of the item on which you are grading him or her by marking the appropriate spaces on the answer sheet. If you rate the teacher as excellent or superior on the point or item, mark 5; if you consider the teacher good or above average, mark 4; if you rate the teacher average, mark 3; if you rate the teacher below average, mark 2; if you rate the teacher poor, mark 1. The judgements you express are to be based solely on your experience in this particular class. If you are enrolled for more than one class under the same teacher, you will be asked to complete a form for each class.

On the answer sheet please indicate the following information: 1) instructor's name; 2) catalog number and section of class (after Name of Test); 3) number of semesters you have been enrolled in college at (college) or elsewhere (after Grade or Class); indicate this by 1 for first semester in college, 2 for second, 3 for third, and 4 for fourth or more semesters or trimesters; do not count summer sessions as a semester or attendance, 4) date. Leave blank the spaces for name, school, city, date of birth, age, and sex.

This information is confidential and no student will be identified.

ITEMS

1. The teacher is familiar with the subject matter of the course and demonstrates thoroughness of scholarship.
2. The teacher presents the subject matter clearly.
3. The teacher makes the materials of the course interesting.
4. The teacher adjusts the presentation of the subject matter to the students' level of comprehension.
5. The feeling between the teacher and student is friendly and cordial.
6. The teacher has his course organized for presentation and is prepared for his class.
7. The text and reading assignments are of definite value.
8. The teacher maintains order the proper behavior in class.
9. The examinations are fair and just.
10. Grading policies and practices are fair and just.
11. The time in the classroom, studio or laboratory is well spent.

12. The teacher informs the students, in ample time, what is expected of them in the course and holds to these standards.
13. The teacher gives the students personal help when they need it.
14. The work outside class is fair for the credits received.
15. The teacher dresses in good taste, is well groomed, and has a good appearance generally.
16. The teacher abides by accepted ethical standards and does not discredit his fellow teacher or the college policies.
17. The teacher manifests a real interest in the entire college program by willingness to cooperate (including student activities).
18. You would recommend this teacher's course in terms of the value of its subject material to your friends whose interests are similar to yours.
19. The teacher challenges you to greater achievement.
20. Rate this teacher on his all-around teaching ability.

Form No. 35

FACULTY EVALUATION

Name of faculty member _____ CODE: 1-2 Poor, 3-4 Fair, 5-6 Average, 7-8 Good, 9-10 Excellent

Date _____

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. Makes adequate plans and preparations for class activities and procedures ____
2. Conducts classes and works with students in a way that stimulates interest and arouses enthusiasm for learning ____
3. Has mastery of subjects taught, and supplements the basic program with a variety of materials, illustrations, and examples ____
4. Makes every possible effort to understand students, recognizes individual differences, and meets the needs of superior, average and slow students ____
5. Exhibits evidence of good classroom management ____
6. Is genuinely concerned about all phases of the school program ____
7. Shows evidence of interest in improving as a teacher, seeks to help improve, and accepts suggestions of superiors without resentment ____
8. Students show evidence of satisfactory progress commensurate with their abilities ____

II. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. Emotional stability _____
2. Judgment _____
3. Initiative _____
4. General health and vitality _____
5. Personal appearance (neat and well groomed) _____
6. Punctuality _____

III. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHERS

1. Cooperates with school officials _____
2. Helps willingly with extra duties _____
3. Participates in community affairs _____
4. Cooperates with other teachers and works well with all school personnel _____
5. Helps foster good public relations with community _____

IV. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND PERFORMANCE

1. Carries out school policies _____
2. Observes confidential nature of matters relating to students, parents, and school personnel _____
3. Refrains from derogatory remarks about students, teachers or the school _____

Form No. 36

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

Name of Instructor _____ Department _____

Mark each item relative to the qualifications of the above named instructor.

1. Professional Qualifications

   A. Knowledge of subject matter 5 4 3 2 1

   B. Ability to organize 5 4 3 2 1

   C. Effective use of instructional materials 5 4 3 2 1

   D. Ability to motivate students 5 4 3 2 1

2. Personal Qualifications

   A. General health and emotional stability 5 4 3 2 1

   B. Accuracy and attention to detail 5 4 3 2 1

   C. Personal initiative 5 4 3 2 1

   D. Ability to implement policy and procedure 5 4 3 2 1

3. Personal Relationships

   A. Respected by students and faculty 5 4 3 2 1

   B. Professional ethics 5 4 3 2 1

4. Recommended for re-employment

	Yes	No
Department Chairman _____	____	____
Dean, Division or Student Affairs _____	____	____
Dean of Academic Affairs _____	____	____

Attach faculty self-evaluation

Form No. 37

Instructor Number

This is a measurement device which will give your instructor an idea of how you react to his course. It will supply him with the information with which he can decide whether or not changes need to be made. You will notice that the questionnaire is divided into several categories. This was done to help us isolate the different qualities which make up the teaching process. For each item we have limited you to a "yes", "no", or "sometimes" answer but at the end of each category there is a space provided for you to make a comment on any of the items or to suggest another item to be included in the category. If you need additional room, use back of paper.

Your thoughtful consideration of this questionnaire is most appreciated. It will enable your instructor to have another tool whereby he can measure and improve his instruction.

I. Classroom Techniques	Yes	No	Sometimes	
A. Visual Aids				
1. Uses library assignments to supplement classroom instruction	___	___	___	1.
2. Writes difficult words on blackboard and explains them	___	___	___	2.
3. Uses the following to clarify ideas:				
a. blackboard	___	___	___	3.
b. movies	___	___	___	4.
c. overhead projector	___	___	___	5.
d. personal examples	___	___	___	6.
e. newspapers	___	___	___	7.
f. magazine articles	___	___	___	8.
4. Shows movies which I enjoy as well as learn from	___	___	___	9.
5. Comment				
B. Lecture				
1. Puts ideas across logically	___	___	___	10.
2. Reads lecture notes in a monotone	___	___	___	11.
3. Lectures but does not read lecture	___	___	___	12.
4. Uses words which I don't understand	___	___	___	13.
5. Strays so far from the point that I get confused	___	___	___	14.
6. Lectures too much	___	___	___	15.
7. Comment				

C. Discussion	Yes	No	Sometimes	
1. Lets students ask questions in class	___	___	___	16.
2. Admits when he is wrong	___	___	___	17.
3. Avoids my questions	___	___	___	18.
4. Seems too interested in keeping order	___	___	___	19.
5. Controls things so that I can respond only in prescribed ways	___	___	___	20.
6. Comment				

*Include section number if a separate analysis for each section is desired. If you do not want a separate analysis for each section put a zero in the first block followed by your six digit instructor number.

D. Tests				
1. Gives tests which relate to course content	___	___	___	21.
2. Avoids tricky test items	___	___	___	22.
3. Uses tests for teaching as well as evaluation	___	___	___	23.
4. Does not repeat same tests year after year	___	___	___	24.
5. Creates exams which make me feel eager to see how I will do	___	___	___	25.
6. Frightens me with his exams	___	___	___	26.
7. Returns exams promptly	___	___	___	27
8. Comment				

E. Interest Level				
1. Applies subject to everyday life and student experience	___	___	___	28.
2. Sticks generally to subject	___	___	___	29.
3. Stimulates students by raising interesting questions for discussion	___	___	___	30.
4. Is interested in subject matter he teaches	___	___	___	31.
5. Just reads from book in class	___	___	___	32.
6. Has opened my eyes to new ideas, to new ways of seeing, has made me question further, aroused my curiosity	___	___	___	33.
7. Comment				

F. Voice qualities				
1. Has use and command of the English language	___	___	___	34.
2. Speaks too softly	___	___	___	35.
3. Speaks too loud	___	___	___	36.
4. Mumbles	___	___	___	37
5. Uses a monotone (never varies voice)	___	___	___	38.
6. Comment				

G. Mechanics	Yes	No	Sometimes	
1. Explains method of grading	___	___	___	39.
2. Keeps accurate record of grades, attendance	___	___	___	40.
3. Teaches and encourages note taking	___	___	___	41.
4. States the objectives of the course in terms which I can understand	___	___	___	42.
5. Hands out written objectives for the course	___	___	___	43.
6. Comment				

H. Coverage				
1. Has a well-organized course with clear assignments	___	___	___	44.
2. Requires too much outside reading	___	___	___	45.
3. Shows how the material being covered applies to the course's objectives	___	___	___	46.
4. Comment				

II. Out of Class				
1. Offers help sessions	___	___	___	47.
2. Gives aid to students who ask for outside help	___	___	___	48.
3. Encourages students to use books and the library for independent learning	___	___	___	49.
4. Encourages students to read for class enrichment and personal pleasure	___	___	___	50.
5. Creates an atmosphere in which I feel I can freely discuss things	___	___	___	51.
6. Comment				

III. Interpersonal--My Instructor Does the Following:				
1. Shows personal interest in my work	___	___	___	52.
2. Lets me express myself	___	___	___	53.
3. Is too sarcastic	___	___	___	54.
4. Makes belittling remarks	___	___	___	55.
5. Encourages students to respond in class	___	___	___	56.
6. Bases grades on work done, and not on personal feelings	___	___	___	57.
7. Has confidence in himself	___	___	___	58.
8. Tries to be fair and has character and integrity	___	___	___	59.

	Yes	No	Sometimes	
9. Accepts me as a person	___	___	___	60.
10. Makes me earn grades, no handouts	___	___	___	61.
11. Is friendly outside the classroom	___	___	___	62.
12. Treats students as adults	___	___	___	63.
13. Is willing to review my grade and progress	___	___	___	64.
14. Makes me feel I would never be competent in this subject; my best efforts aren't good enough	___	___	___	65.
15. Comment				

Form No. 38

DEPARTMENT _____ NAME OF PERSON EVALUATED _____

DEPARTMENT HEAD'S EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

	Sup.	Sat.	Poor
I. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS			
A. Is Healthy and Emotionally Stable	(__)	(__)	(__)
B. Is Neat and Well Groomed in Appearance	(__)	(__)	(__)
C. Thinks Logically and Makes Practical Decisions	(__)	(__)	(__)
D. Is Accurate	(__)	(__)	(__)
E. Is Punctual	(__)	(__)	(__)
F. Takes Necessary and Appropriate Action on His Own	(__)	(__)	(__)
G. Is Dedicated to His Profession	(__)	(__)	(__)
II. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHERS			
A. Is Respected by Students	(__)	(__)	(__)
B. Is Responsible and Dependable	(__)	(__)	(__)
C. Is Friendly, Understanding, Sympathetic with Community, Other Staff Members and Administration	(__)	(__)	(__)
D. Is Professionally Ethical	Yes (__)		No (__)
E. Shows Consideration for Students	Yes (__)		No (__)
III. TEACHING (SKILLS) ABILITY	Sup.	Sat.	Poor
A. Knows Subject Matter	(__)	(__)	(__)
B. Takes Action to Improve Himself	(__)	(__)	(__)
C. Uses Instructional Materials Effectively	(__)	(__)	(__)
D. Develops Student Interest and Eagerness to Learn	(__)	(__)	(__)
E. Maintains Student Control	(__)	(__)	(__)

IV. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS TEACHER FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT Yes (__) No (__)

(__) A. I recommend this instructor be kept on annual contract.
(__) B. I do not recommend this instructor to be reemployed.
(__) C. I recommend this instructor's status remain unchanged.
(__) D. I recommend this instructor be given continuing contract.

V. DID YOU DISCUSS THIS EVALUATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT MEMBER CONCERNED? Yes (__) No (__)

_____ _____
Date Signature of Department Head

DIRECTIONS: Please complete all items on this form. Please fill in the date and affix your signature. Place in the enclosed envelope, seal, and place in the mail box of the Dean of Academic Affairs.

Form No. 39

AN INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Dean, Adacemic Affairs _____ Director, Counseling Services _____
Dean, Administrative Affairs _____ Registrar _____
Dean, Student Affairs _____ Director, Computer Center _____
Business Manager _____ Other (Please name) _____

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	No Basis For Evaluation
1. Personality						
2. Organizational ability						
3. Executive ability						
4. Tact and diplomacy						
5. Sound judgment						
6. Fairness						
7. Appearance						
8. Poise						
9. Emotional stability						
10. Cooperation with staff						
11. Ability to enlist cooperation						
12. Enthusiasm and vigor						
13. Philosophy regarding: Educational Values						
Democratic Principles						
Professional Attitude						
Dignity of Staff Members						
Community Participation						
14. Concern for student welfare						

DIRECTIONS: Please do not write your name or otherwise identify yourself anywhere on this form. Place in the enclosed envelope, seal, and place in the President's mail box.

Form No. 40

STUDENTS'S RATING SCALE FOR INSTRUCTORS

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____ _____ _____
TERM CLASS AND SECTION

The college is rating itself in an effort to find out the quality of teaching in this institution. The Office of the Dean of Academic Affairs will compile a summary of all of these rating scales which will serve for the guidance of the instructor in improving instruction. Your answer to this questionnaire will not be seen by the instructor. Your honest judgment is all that the questionnaire requires.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME OR OTHERWISE IDENTIFY YOURSELF IN ANY WAY ON THIS FORM.

(Place an "X" on ONE of the lines under each of the following)

1. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
   Systematic and thoroughly organized ____
   Adequate; could be better ____
   Inadequate organization, detracts from course ____
   Confused and unsystematic ____

2. TEACHING METHODS
   Methods well planned and adapted to subject and students ____
   Some variety of method ____
   Same technique used continuously ____
   No evidence of planned methods ____

3. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS
   Willing to help ____
   Moderately helpful ____
   Avoids individual conferences ____
   Cold, unconcerned with students ____

4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
   Exceptionally well informed in field of subject ____
   Adequately informed ____
   Not well informed ____
   Very inadequately informed ____

5. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS
   Testing excellently done ____
   Testing is satisfactory ____
   Testing is sometimes unfair ____
   Testing is mostly careless and unfair ____

6. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN
   Explanations clear and to the point ____
   Explanations usually adequate ____
   Explanations seldom given ____

7. ENCOURAGEMENT TO THINKING
   Really makes you think for yourself ____
   Considerable stimulation to thinking ____
   Not much thinking required ____

8. SPEAKING ABILITY
   Voice and diction excellent ____
   Adequate, does not detract from course ____
   Poor delivery detracts from course ____
   Poor speaking techniques serious handicap in course ____

9. ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS
   Always courteous and considerate ____
   Tries to be considerate, but sometimes too critical or sarcastic ____
   Generally too critical ____
   Generally too sarcastic ____

10. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT
    Enthusiastic, enjoys teaching ____
    Rather interested ____
    Bored-routine interest ____
    Not interested, tired of subject ____

11. SENSE OF HUMOR OR SERIOUSNESS
    Fairly well balanced ____
    Over-serious; no sense of humor ____
    Makes class too much of a joke, too little seriousness ____

12. HONESTY OF CLASS
    No cheating ____
    Occasional cheating ____
    Much cheating ____

13. GRADING BASIS
    Clearly explained ____
    Vague ____
    Not given at all ____

14. PUNCTUALITY (CHECK TWO)
    Usually in class on time ____
    Usually late to class ____
    Usually dismisses on time ____
    Occasionally dismisses late ____
    Occasionally dismisses early ____

15. PERSONAL MANNERISMS
    Wholly free from annoying mannerisms ____
    Occasional objectionable mannerisms ____
    Frequently exhibits irritating mannerisms ____
    Constantly exhibits irritating mannerisms ____

SPECIFY: _____
_____
_____

Form No. 41

COURSE AND TEACHER EVALUATION

To Professors: For the first time, it will now be possible for the Course and Teacher Evaluation to evaluate as many class sections as are willing to participate in our program. This represents a significant step forward and was taken only after our staff felt confident that our questionnaire and evaluation procedure represented a reliable and accurate means of measuring student attides on courses and teachers. This confidence stems from the experience of four previous evaluations of a limited nature during the past three years -- coupled with the continual corrections and "debugging" that has been made in our operations based on analysis of feedback and results from these four evaluations. Response from those teachers who have participated in these past evaluations has been most enthusiastic.

Therefore, we are heartily encouraging you to take part in the program for this quarter by returning the enclosed application form. We also urge that you participate with as many of your present class sections as possible. This is important for two reasons: (1) it gives you a good cross-check for purposes of comparison on student attitudes in your various classes; (2) it gives us valuable data on the reliability of our testing instrument and procedures.

We are enclosing a brief description of the Course and Teacher Evaluation Program. It is important to note that the results from the teacher evaluation segment of the questionnaire are solely for the use by the individual teacher and completely confidential. Further questions may be directed to myself by mail or by phoning. Please note the deadline on the application form.

Description of Course and Teacher Evaluation

DEVELOPMENT. Since the summer of 1966, Student Government has been working on a plan of Course and Teacher Evaluation for the _____. Much research has gone into the planning of this program. Resumes and copies of other programs at other colleges and universities were obtained and analyzed. The advice and help of knowledgeable faculty personnel was sought and used. From this research the questionnaire and operating procedure was designed and then tested in our trial programs of December, 1966 and of April, 1967.

From the experience of these trial runs, the questionnaire and procedures were settled and adopted for general use in the evaluation. Two formal evaluations were then administered in May, 1968 and November, 1968, on a limited basis to 20 percent of the class sections selected at random. Feedback from these two evaluations has now been analyzed; and appropriate adjustments have been made in our questionnaire and procedure to yield what we consider to be a highly reliable and effective means of measuring student attitudes on courses and teachers.

PURPOSE. This program is directed toward the University. It is our main intention to improve the quality of education at this University by stressing the importance of good teaching and relevant courses through the use of this evaluation. For the teacher who desires it, this program will provide useful confidential feedback information about the attitudes of his students toward his teaching. Student attitudes toward courses and their content will also be collected for analysis, and if necessary, reform. Student attitudes about their teachers and courses, although not the only factor, are important considerations for quality education.

With this program the quality of education at the University will improve. We feel that the potential benefits of this program in terms of this quality education justifies Student Government's concern with it.

ENDORSEMENT. With these purposes in mind, this program has been endorsed by the Council of Academic Deans and various members of the faculty and administration. Response has been most enthusiastic from those teachers who participated in the May, 1968 and November, 1968 evaluations.

OPERATIONS. The Questionnaire: In the effort to develop the best questionnaire possible, it was decided to base it on the "Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction." Therefore, the 11 questions on teacher evaluation and the 15 questions on course evaluation have been directly adapted from this nationally recognized instrument. These questions are designed for response on IBM answer sheets for fast and accurate scoring. Following these 26 questions is a page on which the student comments in writing on the good and not so good points of his teacher and course. This will give depth to the numerical ratings derived from the first part of the evaluation. Both the IBM answers and personal comments will be returned to our office for grading and scoring.

Test Administration: When a teacher volunteers for evaluation, he fills out an application stating his course, class size, period, and the name of a reliable volunteer from his class to administer the evaluation. This is used for administrative scheduling purposes. It has been found that when a person other than the teacher administers the evaluation, the results are more reliable. After the students have completed the questionnaire, the answer sheets will be sealed and deposited in a central location for grading and scoring. It is important to note that the protection of the teacher's identity will be guaranteed at all times.

Grading and Scoring: Those questions from the "Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction" will first be sent to the Board of University Examiners to transpose the answers to IBM cards. These cards will then be sorted and sent through the IBM 360 computer at the Computing Center. For each question the computer will find its high and low responses, its mean, and its percentile rating in relation to the others who participated. This will be reported to the teacher on the first page of the Teacher Report Form. On the following page, the

individual comments of the students will be noted. Information on student attitudes toward their teachers as noted on the Teacher Report Form will be sent directly to the teacher. No one will have access to this record without proper consent from the particular teacher. Absolute confidentiality is guaranteed. Information on student attitudes toward their courses, on the other hand, will be noted on the Course Report Forms for the use of Deans, faculty, and others interested.

As this institution uses the copyrighted "Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction" and we do not have permission to copy this material, it is not included. Copies are available from the Purdue Research Foundation, Lafayette, Indiana.

Form No. 42

Student Evaluation

Name of Instructor _____

Number of Course: _____ Section: _____ Date: _____

You are not supposed to write your name on these sheets. This is confidential. You are requested to enter in the blank space to the left of each statement the number which, in your honest judgment, appropriately describes the course or instructor for each topic in question. Place comments or suggestions on the back of this sheet.

____ The course material was: (1) well organized; (2) adequately organized; (3) loosely organized.

____ The amount of work required was: (1) too much; (2) about right; (3) too little.

____ The course has helped me to develop and/or to improve my ability to think clearly and objectively: (1) very much; (2) somewhat; (3) very little.

____ The objectives of this course were: (1) clearly defined; (2) satisfactorily defined; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ The assignments were definite and well understood: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ The instructor helped students feel free to ask questions: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

The instructor was:

____ a. Well informed on the subject: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ b. Tolerant of ideas other than his own; (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ c. Enthusiastic about the subject: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

The instructor:

____ a. Spoke clearly and distinctly: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ b. Had annoying personal peculiarities and mannerisms: (1) yes; (2) no. If you wrote (1) in the blank space to the left, please explain why on reverse side of this sheet.

____ c. Had good command of the English language: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

Regarding major tests and examinations:

____ a. Sufficient advance notice was given: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ b. Variety and type of questions were adequate and clearly stated: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ c. Grading procedure was satisfactory: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ d. Tests were returned and/or discussed in class: (1) always; (2) most of the time; (3) part of the time; (4) never.

____ In my experience with instructors, I consider this one: (1) among the best; (2) about average; (3) unsatisfactory.

Form No. 43

FACULTY EVALUATION

Person Being Evaluated _____ Years on Staff _____

Major Teaching Assignment _____

Division Chairman _____ Date _____

NOTE: This evaluation form should be completed by the Division Chairman once during the academic year for faculty members on continuing contract and twice during the academic year for faculty members on annual contract.

DIRECTIONS: Carefully mark each item according to the following scale.
Superior-5 Above average-4 Average-3 Below average-2 Poor-1

PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS	5	4	3	2	1
1. Emotional Stability	___	___	___	___	___
2. General Health	___	___	___	___	___
3. Personal Appearance	___	___	___	___	___
4. Judgment	___	___	___	___	___
5. Dependability	___	___	___	___	___
6. Integrity	___	___	___	___	___
7. Enthusiasm	___	___	___	___	___
8. Resourcefulness	___	___	___	___	___

TEACHING (SKILLS) ABILITY

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and related areas	___	___	___	___	___
2. Organizes and presents subject matter in a clear and logical manner	___	___	___	___	___
3. Uses effective techniques of evaluation	___	___	___	___	___
4. Stimulates student interest and eagerness to learn	___	___	___	___	___
5. Keeps abreast of developments in teaching field	___	___	___	___	___
6. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning	___	___	___	___	___
7. Is receptive to experimenting with all phases of instruction	___	___	___	___	___

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS

1. Is respected by students	___	___	___	___	___
2. Is respected by staff	___	___	___	___	___
3. Is cooperative with other staff members and the administration	___	___	___	___	___

PROFESSIONAL AND MORAL ETHICS AND PERFORMANCE

1. Demonstrates professional attitude toward college assignments	___	___	___	___	___
2. Understands and carries out college policies	___	___	___	___	___
3. Observes confidential nature of matters relating to others	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintains high ethical standards	___	___	___	___	___

GENERAL COMMENTS: In the space below, indicate your general impression of the overall effectiveness of the instructor.

_____

Signature, Division Chairman